THE
ARYAN PATH

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

VOLUME III

January-December 1932

ULT LIBRARY
BANGALORE.
ACCN. NO 126

THEOSOPHY CO. (INDIA) LTD.
51, Esplanade Road
BOMBAY

126
140
ARY

INDEX

Index of Articles

Abstract Idea, The—*Max Plowman* 438
Alchemy in China—*By E.J. Holmyard* 745
Apollonius of Tyana—*By Geoffrey West* 319
Arraignment of Modern Science (A symposium) 660
Art of Writing in Ancient India, The—*By S. V. Venkateswara* 30
Aryan Culture in Eastern Turkistan —*By J. C. Tavadia* 217
Avataras, Bodhisatvas, and Tirthankaras—*By S. V. Venkateswara* 834

Beneath the Surface: India's Problem—*By N. B. Parulekar* ... 167
Best Verse in the Gita, The—*By G.V. Ketkar* 256
Best Verse in the Gita, The: A Note—*By Asiatic* 260
Blind Man but a Karma-Yogi, A— *By N. B. Parulekar* 377
Buddhas of Confession—*By. H. P. Blavatsky* 296

Cat as an Emblem, The—*By M. Oldfield Howey* 478
Changing the Mind of the Race (A symposium) 340
Chaos of Modern Psychology, The —*By J. D. Beresford* 399
Children and the League of Nations —*By Gwendoline I. M. Carlier* 244
Chinese Book of Life, A, and A Psychologist's Reading of It— *By Hugh I'A. Fausset*... ... 203
Christianity and Christian Sentiment —*By Frank Betts* 264
Civilized Life—*By H. P. Blavatsky* 84
Comparative Study of Religions— *By D. S. Sarma* 701
Confusions of Modern Science— *By C. E. M. Joad* 665
Conscience, The Bridge 1
Correspondence—72, 147, 288, 357, 429, 501, 573, 716, 787, 849
Cross and Fire—*By H. P. Blavatsky* 110
Cultural Bond between China and Japan, The—*By Kiang Kang-hu* 473
Curse of Religions—*By Joseph Gaer* 726
Cycle of the Senses, The—*By Helen Bryant* 527

Danger of Scientific Dogmatism, The—*By Henry Pratt Fairchild* 660
Determinism and Free Will—*By J. D. Beresford* 540
Development of Consciousness, The —*By J. D. Beresford* 486
Devotion in Advaitism—*By Swami Jagadiswarananda* 808
Doctrine of Non-Violence, The: A Study in the Gita—*By G. V. Ketkar* 442
Doctrine of Non-Violence (Motive and Action): A Note 447
Dostoevsky's Affinities with Buddhism—*By Philip Henderson* ... 687
Drama of Life, The: Lila of Ishwara —*By Hugh I'A. Fausset* ... 481
Dreams of Future Events—*By R. L. Mégroz* 324
Druidism—*By W. Arthur Peacock* 449
Druids—*By H. P. Blavatsky* ... 452

Easter Island, On—*By H. P. Blavatsky* 497
Eastern Art and The Occident— *By Jean Buhot* 85
Education and Ideals—*By George Godwin* 607

Ends and Sayings : 77, 151, 220, 290, 361, 432, 504, 576, 649, 719, 790, 854
Evolution of Religion, The—*By J. D. Beresford*... 632
Experimental Origin of Knowledge, I, The—*By W. Wilson Leisenring* 692
Experimental Origin of Knowledge, II, The,—*By W. Wilson Leisenring* 760

Fifty Years of Psychical Research 579
First Book of Madame Blavatsky, The—*By J. Middleton Murry*... 58
Five Lights at the Cross Roads—*By Geoffrey West* 156, 319, 468, 603, 755
Free Will and Modern Psychology —*By C. E. M. Joad* 308
Free Will in Indian Philosophy—*By G. R. Malkani* 387
From Authority to Inspiration—*By Lawrence Hyde* 25
From Paris : A Plea for Intolerance —*By J. B.* 569

Gift of the Dharma, The : Mahayana Buddhism in the West—*By M. G. Mori* 120
God and His Shadow—*By J. D. Beresford* 207
Goethe and the East—*By Dr. F. Otto Schrader* ... 161
Good Life, The : Conflict of Morals —*By Paul E. Johnson*... ... 123
Grace Before Meat—*By Lloyd Morris* 407
Great Jnana-Yogin of the West, A —*By D. S. Sarma* 88

Hillel—*By Geoffrey West* ... 603
Hindu Herbs 381

Impersonal God of the Sufis, The—*By Mumtaz Armstrong* ... 330
Impractical Philosophy, An—*By J. D. Beresford* 342
Inadequacy of Rationalism, The—*By Max Plowman* 530
India and Objective Reality I—*By J. W. T. Mason* 584
India and Objective Reality II—*By T. Chitnavis* 588
India and Objective Reality—*By A. R. Wadia* 674
In Search of Peace 153
Is Poverty the Badge of Saints ?—*By Phoebe Fenwick Gaye* ... 600

Journalist of Future India, The—*By Ramananda Chatterjee* ... 797

Kalidasa—Stray Thoughts—*By C. R. King* 831
Karma as a Theory of Causation—*By Jagadisan M. Kumarappa* 181
Karma as a Theory of Retribution —*By Jagadisan M. Kumarappa* 729

Land of Psyche and of Nous—*By A. E. Waite* 845
Leisure of the Future, The—*By C. E. M. Joad* 41
Life of the Soul According to Jesus, The—*By B. W. Bacon* ... 21
Line of Buddhas, The—*By N. K. Bhagvat* 304
Locke's Message for To-day—*By Dorothy Turner* 510

Machinery and the Soul of Man—*By R. M. Fox* 132
Magic and Occultism—*By C. J. S. Thompson* 199
Message of All Time, The ... 293
Miracles of Jesus, The Twin Child, The—*By A. Haggerty Krappe* 229
Modern Superstitions—*By G. B. Harrison* 94
Motive and Action 447
Muslim Esotericism—*By Hugh I'A. Fausset* 770

My Duty—*By Paul E. Johnson* ... 545
Mystical Teachings of Avicenna, The—*By Margaret Smith* ... 520
Mysticism of the Druses—*By Syed A. Rafique* 764

"Natural" and "Spiritual" Mysticism—Shankara and Eckhart —*By D. L. Murray* 549
Need of Our World, The 435
New Books and Old—58, 128, 199, 269, 340, 415, 481, 549, 637, 701, 766, 834
New Path to Racial Amity, A—*By Jagadisan M. Kumarappa* ... 462
Notes on H. P. Blavatsky's "Psychic and Noetic Action"—*By W. Wilson Leisenring* 274

One Hundred Years of Science: Thoughts on the Centenary Celebration—*By J. W. N. Sullivan.* 16
Orpheus, A Maker of History—*By C. R. King* 411
Our Path 795
Our Third Volume 77

Passive Resistance—*By George Godwin* 804
Path as Conceived by Plato, The—*By Giuseppe Rensi* 251
Path of Tagore—*By Mulk Raj Anand* 821
Paths, The: The Good, the Beautiful, the True—*By Christmas Humphreys* 825
Patriotism or Nationalism—*By Vernon Bartlett* 611
Permanent Thing that is India, The —*By H. N. Brailsford* ... 637
Philosophical Confirmation of Theosophy, The—*By Philip Chapin Jones* 811
Philosophical Foundations of World Understanding, The—*By F. S. C. Northrop* 368
Philosophy and Mysticism—*By J. D. Beresford* 766
Physics, Philosophy and Theosophy —*By Philip Chapin Jones* ... 192
Plato's Message for the Moderns—*By D. L. Murray* 340
Plea for Intolerance, A (From Paris)—*By J. B.* 569
Primitive Religion—*By Francis James* 515
Problem of Consciousness, The—*By J. D. Beresford* 816
Problem of Evil, The—*By J. K. Majumdar* 751
Problem of the "Man" as Becoming, The—*By Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids* 297, 392
Ptolemy Soter—*By Geoffrey West* 156
Purpose in Public Policy—*By C. Delisle Burns* 415
Puzzle of Indian Philosophy, The —*By C. E. M. Joad* 552

Rebirth of Western Civilization, The—*By George Godwin* ... 97
Reign of Law, The—*By Ivor B. Hart* 404
Religion and Poverty in India—*By Syed A. Rafique* 248
Religion and Social Service—*By Lawrence Hyde* 382
Religion of William Blake—*By John Middleton Murry*... ... 738
Resurrection of the Past, The—*By Ralph Van Deman Magoffin* ... 314
Rhythm and Life—*By Sir Herbert Barker* 173
"Ripeness is All"—*By Max Plowman* 226

Science and Ethics—*By Pramathanath Mukhopadhyaya* 670
Science and Pre-Science—*By Pramathanatha Mukhopadhyaya*... 238
Seek for the Larger View : An Interview with Lord Haldane—*By R. L. Mégroz* 47
Sick at Heart 723
Significance of Lenin, The—*By Marion Robinson* 187
Simeon ben Yohai—*By Geoffrey West* 755

Simon Magus—*By Geoffery West* 468
Simplification 651
Some Alchemists of Islam—*By E. J. Holmyard* 102
Soul on the Stage—*By R. H. B.* ... 680
Some Spiritual Notes in Modern Verse—*By Vida D. Scudder* ... 697
Song of the Midland Sea, The—*By Robert Sencourt*... 176
Spiritual Reality—*By Max Plowman* 621
Story of Hypnotism, The—*By Henry J. Strutton* 536
Study of Philosophy in India Today, The—*By A. R. Wadia* ... 10
Suggestion 365
Symbolism of the Cross, The—*By Maurice A. Canney* ... 107
Synthesis—*By J. D. Beresford* ... 115

Three Rules for Daily Practice ... 223
Thrill Psychosis, The— *By Charles Dernier* 735
Towards World Brotherhood (a Symposium) 607
True Asceticism 81
Truth and Superstition—*By G. B. Harrison* 683
Two H. P. Blavatskys, The—*By R. A. V. Morris* 52

Unemployment: Past Karma and Future Hope—*By J. D. Beresford* 37

Virtues of Herbs, The—*By H. Stanley Redgrove* 269
Vision of John Keats, The—*By John Middleton Murry*... ... 454

War and Peace 507
Way of Intuition, The—*By Hugh I'A. Fausset* 4
Western Knowledge—*By Geoffrey West* 128
Western Need of Zen Buddhism, The—*By Alan W. Watts* ... 261
What Does Death Mean to You ?—*By Max Plowman* 438, 530, 621
What is Faith—*By J. S. Collis* ... 594
Where Ideal of Government Was Realized—*By Isoh Yamagata* 334
Who Are the Aswins ?—*By H. P. Blavatsky* 228
Will—*By H. P. Blavatsky* ... 313
Wordsworth's Mysticism—*By Hugh I'A. Fausset* 654
Worship of Beauty, The—*By D. S. Sarma* 616

Your Law—*By Paul E. Johnson* 627

Index of Book Reviews

Adventure, An—*By C. A. E. Moberly and E. F. Jourdain* ... 279
Asiatic Mythology—*By J. Hackin and others* 785

Bodhisattva Doctrine—*By Har Dayal* 834
Book of the Gradual Sayings, The —*Trans. by F. L. Woodward* 427
Brave New World—*By Aldous Huxley* 422

Caste and Race in India—*By G. S. Ghurye* 842
Children of Mu, The—*By James Churchward* 67
Civilization as Divine Superman—*By Alexander Raven* 568
Common Sense and the Child—*By Ethel Mannin* 283
Conflict of the Individual and the Mass in the Modern World—*By E. D. Martin* 779
Confucius and Confucianism—*By Richard Wilhelm* 278

Contemporary and His Soul, The—*By Irwin Edman* 64
Co-operative Movement in India—*By Eleanor M. Hough*... ... 706
Creative Energy—*By I. and L. E. Mears* 281
Cross and Indian Thought, The—*By V. Chakkarai* 710

Dawn—*By Theodore Dreiser* ... 64
Devil's Camera, The—*By R.G. Burnett and E. D. Martell*... ... 782
Devil in Legend and Literature—*By Maximilian Rudwin* ... 564
Does History Repeat Itself ?—*By R. F. McWilliams* 287
Dreamers and Doers—*By O. P. Hamilton* 65
Dṛg-dṛśya-viveka—*Trans. by Swami Nikhilananda* 563

Earlier Religion of Greece in the Light of Cretan Discoveries—*By Sir Arthur Evans* 493
Easter Island: Home of the Scornful Gods—*By Robert J. Casey*... 496
Education of the Whole Man, The —*By L. P. Jacks* 69
Elephant-Lore of the Hindus, The —*By Franklin Edgerton* ... 347
Erewhon and Erewhon Revisited —*By Samuel Butler* 780
Essai de Grammaire Sogdienne—*By E. Benveniste* 217
Essays on the Natural Origin of the Mind—*By C. A. Strong* ... 70
Etapes—*By M. Dugard* 348
Ethical Religion of Zoroaster, The —*By M. M. Dawson* 556
Experiences Facing Death—*By Mary Austin* 352
Extension of Consciousness, The —*By C. W. Olliver* 843

Fountain, The—*By Charles Morgan* 242
Fragments of a Faith Forgotten—*By G. R. S. Mead* 285
Franciscan Adventure, The—*By Vidda Dutton Scudder* ... 146
Freedom of Will—*By N.O. Lossky* (Trans. by Natalie Duddington) 566
From Orpheus to Paul—*By Vittorio D. Macchioro* 141
Fundamentals of the Esoteric Philosophy—*By G. de Purucker* ... 426

Greeks, The—*By Rosalind Murray* 499
Grimhaven—*By Robert Joyce Tasker* 66

Heredity in the Light of Esoteric Philosophy—*By Irene Bastow Hudson* 842
Hillel—*By Geoffrey West* ... 103
History of Indian Philosophy, A—*By Surendranath Dasgupta* ... 552
History of the Maya, The—*By Thomas Gann and Eric Thompson* 276
History of Fire and Flame—*By Oliver C. de C. Ellis* 713
Holy Kabbalah, The—*By A. E. Waite* 143
Hypnotism: Black Magic in Science—*By H. P. Blavatsky* ... 353

I Lost My Memory—(*Faber & Faber*) 783
Ideals of Hinduism—*By Kashi Nath* 705
Illustrated Magic—*By Ottaker Fischer* 707
In the Footsteps of the Buddha—*By Rene Grousset* 648
Indian Dust, being Letters from the Punjab—*By Philip Ernest Richards* 558
Initiations and Initiates in Tibet—*By Alexandra David-Neel* ... 71
Interpretation of Religious Experience, The—*By Percy Gardner* 207

Isis Unveiled (Centenary Anniversary Edition)—*By H. P. Blavatsky* 58, 199

Jainism in Northern India—*By C. J. Shah* 834
Jewish Mysticism—*By Martin Buber* (trans. by *Lucy Cohen*) ... 424

Kabir and His Followers—*By F. E. Keay* 353
Kandan the Patriot—*By K.S.Venkataramani* 351
Keys of Power, The—*By J. Abbot* 775

Lady of the Boat, The—*By Lady Murasaki* 710
Legacy of Islam, The—*Edited by Sir Thomas Arnold and Alfred Guillaume* 349
Leonardo da Vinci—*By Clifford Bax* 708
Les Deux Sources de la Morale et de la Religion—*By Henri Bergson* 766

Man and his Technics—*By Oswald Spengler*... 778
Medieval India—*By A. Usuf Ali.* 645
Mencius—*By Leonard A. Lyall* 495
Mencius on the Mind—*By I. A. Richards* 781
Mind of Leonard da Vinci, The—*By Edward McCurdy* 708
Miner, The—*By F. C. Boden* ... 282
Modern Herbal, A—*By Mrs. M. Grieve* 269
Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization—*Ed. by Sir John Marshall* 637
Music at Night—*By Aldous Huxley* 490
My Diaries: 1888-1914—*By Wilfrid Scawen Blunt* 566
Mystery of Life—*By John Butler Burke* 428
Mysticism, East and West—*By Rudolf Otto* 549

Necessity of Communism, The—*By J. Middleton Murry* ... 415
New Discoveries Relating to the Antiquity of Man—*By Sir Arthur Keith* 417
Nicholas of Cusa—*By Henry Bett* 784
Number Key to Ancient Wisdom, The—*By J. W. T. Carrington* 777

On Khaddar—*By Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya* 132
Oriental Conference Papers—*By Sir J. J. Modi* 844
Orpheus: Myths of the World—*By Padraic Colum* 215
Osiris—*By H. P. Cooke* 711
Other-World Stuff—*By Charles J. Whitby* 567
Our Compelling Gods and Life's Evolutionary Cycle—*By H. F. Hawes* 647
Outline of Modern Knowledge, An—*Edited by William Ross* ... 128

Peep into the Early History of India, A—*By Sir R. G. Bhandarkar* 69
Philosophy of Islam—*By Khansahib Khaja Khan* 770
Plato and His Dialogues—*By G. Lowes Dickinson* 340
Prison, The—*By H. P. Brewster* 211
Prisoner's Soul and our Own—*By Elvind Bergrav. Trans. by Laura Gravely* 500
Procession of the Gods, The—*By G. G. Atkins* 701
Prolegomena to a New Metaphysic—*By Thomas Whittaker* ... 839
Prometheus and Epimetheus—*By Carl Spitteler. Trans. by James F. Muirhead* 139
Prometheus Bound—*By Aeschylus* 646

Psychic and Noetic Action—*By H. P. Blavatsky* 274

Raja-Yoga or Occultism—*By H. P. Blavatsky* 138
Religions and Hidden Cults of India—*By Sir George Macmunn* 701
Religion, Morals and the Intellect—*By F. E. Pollard* 355
Religion of Scientists, The—*Edited by C. L. Drawbridge* ... 562
Religion of Tibet, The—*By Sir Charles Bell* 557

Satyākāmā—*By S. E. Stokes* ... 494
Science and Religion: A Broadcast Symposium... 137
Secret of the Golden Flower, The—*Trans. by Richard Wilhelm; with a Commentary by C. J. Jung* 203
Selections from the Works of Su Tung-p'o—*Trans. by C. D. Le Gros Clark* 278
Shrimad-Bhagavad-Gitank and Ishwaranka—*By R. H. P. Poddar* ... ...
Simple Method of Raising the Soul to Contemplation, A—*By Francois Malaval (Trans. by Lucy Menzies)* 424
Six Ways of Knowing, The—*By D. M. Datta* 642
Song and Its Fountains—*By A. E.* 486
Song of God, The—*By Dhan Gopal Mukerji* 212
Song of the Lord, The—*By Edward J. Thomas* 212
Soul of an Atom, The—*By W. Denham Verschoyle* 486
Story of Civilization, The—*By C.E. M. Joad* 212

Talks with Spirit Friends, Bench and Bar 351
Temple Bells—*By A. J. Appasamy* 567
This Human Nature—*By Charles Duff* 212
This Surprising World—*By Gerald Heard* 563
Those Superstitions—*By Charles Igglesden* 645
Tocharische Grammatik—*By W. Schulze, E. Sieg. W. Siegling* ... 218
Towards a Systematic Study of the Vedanta—*By Saroj Kumar Das* 481
Twentieth Century Addresses—*Selected by E. C. Dickinson and Diwan Chand Sharma*... ... 356

Use of the Self, The—*By F. Matthias Alexander*... 486

Water Diviners and Their Methods—*By Henri Mager* 211
What Dare I Think?—*By Julian Huxley* 490
What is Moksha?—*By A. J. Appasamy* 214
Wheel of Fortune, The—*By M. K. Gandhi* 132
Witchcraft, Magic and Alchemy—*By Grillot de Givry (Trans. by J. Courteny Locke)* 207
Work, Health, and Happiness of Mankind, The—*By H. G. Wells* 342
World Chaos—*By William McDougall* 214
World of Epitomizations, The—*By George Perrigo Conger* ... 560

Yoga:—*Ed. by Helmat Palmié* ... 565

Zermatt Dialogues, The—*By Douglas Fawcett* 207
Zohar, The—*By Dr. Ariel Bension* 714
Zohar, The—*Trans. by Harry Sperling and Maurice Symon* ... 714

Index of Correspondence

Allopathic and Ayurvedic Systems —*By M. D.* 789

Banshees—*By Elliott O'Donnell* 147
Buddha in New India, The—*By D. G. V.*... 503

Christian Higher Education in India—*By C. R. King* 716
Cinema as the Materialization of the Human Mind and Spirit, The —*By Huntly Carter* 148

Drama of Life, The—*By Saroj Kumar Das* 788
Dreams and Reincarnation—*By C. E. Hindley Smith* 573

East and West—*By M. R. St. John* 574

India and Objective Reality—*By A. R. Wadia* 853
In Vindication of Vegetarianism—*By H. Reinheimer* 358

Japan and China—*By M. G. Mori* 717

Philosophy and Society—*By M. D.* 502
Practical Internationalism—*By Lilian M. Russell* 429

Reality of Occult Powers, The—*By R. A. V. Morris* 288
Reincarnation of Cities, The—*By Henry Stetson Farrad* 288
Reincarnation—*By Reincarnationist* 789

Science and Philosophy—*By W. W. L.* 357
Science Nears Occultism—*By Ph. D.* 74
Search for Soul—*By R. Naga Raja Sarma* 849
Sense of Sin, The—*By M. G. Mori* 501

Theosophy and Science—*By Cecil Williams* 575
Theosophy and Science—*By Philip Chapin Jones* 787

Vegetarianism—*By Tom Leon* ... 787
Vessels of Wisdom—*By D. G. V.* 851

What is Dogma?—*By M. Dugard* 72

Index of Names and Pseudonyms of Writers of Articles, Reviews and Correspondence

Anand, Mulk Raj 353, 821
Armstrong, Mumtaz 330
Armstrong, R. A. L. 283, 490, 708, 714, 781, 843
Asiatic 260

B. A. (Oxon) 214
Bacon, Benjamin Wisner 21
Barker, Sir Herbert 173
Bartlett, Vernon 611
Beresford, J. D. ... 37, 115, 207, 342, 399, 486, 540, 632, 766, 816
Betts, Frank 264
Bhagvat, N. K. 304
Blavatsky, H. P. (Page filling Extracts from the writings of) 8,-9, 15, 20, 24, 35, 51, 84, 96, 106, 110, 114, 145, 155, 191, 228, 250, 268, 296, 313, 323, 339, 367, 403, 406, 414, 441, 452, 461, 497, 529, 535, 593, 602, 653, 696, 700, 744, 759, 820

Brailsford, H. N. 637
Bryant, Helen 527
B. Sc. 137
Buhot, Jean 85
Burns, C. Delisle 415

C 348
Canney, Maurice A. 107
Carlier, Gwendoline I. M. ... 244
Carter, Huntly 148
Chatterjee, Ramananda 797
Chitnavis, T. 588
Collis, J. S. 594
Cratylus 839
Crosbie, Robert 365, 386

Davids, Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys 297, 392
Davis Hadland... ... 278, 648, 710
Das, Saroj Kumar... 788
Dernier, Charles 735
D. G. V. 503, 851
Dugard, M. 72

E. 567
Editorials
Conscience, The Bridge ... 1
Fifty Years of Psychical Research 579
In Search of Peace 153
Message of All Time, The ... 293
Need of our World, The ... 435
Our Path 795
Sick at Heart 723
Simplification 651
Suggestion 365
Three Rules for Daily Practice 223
True Asceticism 81
War and Peace... 507
E. W. 784

Fairchild, Henry Pratt 660
Farrad, Henry Stetson 288
Fausset, Hugh I'A. 4, 203, 481, 654, 770
F. E. 215
Fox, R. M.... 132

Gaer, Joseph 726
Gaye, Phoebe Fenwick 600
Godwin, George ... 97, 607, 804
Grugan, Leona 497
G. V. K. 428
G. W. W. 139, 500

Haldane, Lord 47
Harrison, G. B. ... 94, 645, 683
Hart, Ivor B. 404
Hasan, Hādī 349
Henderson, Philip... 687
Holmyard, E. J. 102, 745
Howey, M. Oldfield ... 347, 478
Humphreys Christmas ... 427, 825
Hyde, Lawrence 25, 382, 562

Iqbal, Sir Muhammad 626

Jagadiswarananda Swami... ... 808
James, Francis 515
J. B. 569
J. K. M. 710, 842
Joad, C. E. M. ... 41, 308, 552, 665
Johnson, Paul E. ... 123, 545, 627
Jones, Philip Chapin 192, 787, 811
Judge, W. Q. 391, 679

Kang-hu, Kiang 473
Ketkar, G. V. 256, 442
King, C. R. ... 411, 716, 831
Krappe, Alexander Haggerty ... 229
Krishnayya, G. S.... 69
K. S. S. 780, 782
Kumarappa, Jagadisan M. 64, 70, 141, 181, 212, 355, 424, 462, 729

Leisenring, W. Wilson 274, 692, 760
Leon, Tom 787
L. M. 65, 211, 287

Magoffin, Ralph Van Deman ... 314
Mahatma K. H. 57, 631, 754
Majumdar, J. K. 751
Malkani, G. R. 387
Master's Letter, From A 673
Mason, J. W. T. 584
M. D. 502, 789
Mears, I. 495
Mégroz, R. L. 47, 324
M. F. 499, 564
Mori, M. G. ... 120, 501, 717
Morris, Lloyd 407
Morris, R. A. V. 52, 288
Mukhopadhyaya, Pramathanath 238,670
Murray, D. L. 340, 549
Murry, John Middleton 58, 454, 738

Nag, Kalidas 557, 645
N. K. 705
Northrop, F. S. C. 368

O. 558
O'Donnell Elliott 147

Parker, L. E. ...276, 281, 285, 496
Parulekar, N. B. 167, 377
Pavitrananda, ... 706
Peacock, W. Arthur 449
P. F. 351
Ph. D. 74, 214, 779
Plowman, Max ...226, 438, 530, 621

Rafique, Syed A. 248, 764
R. A. V. M. 67, 351, 352, 417, 426, 493, 647, 777, 783, 785
Redgrove, H. Stanley 269
Reincarnationist 789
Reinheimer, H. 358
Rensi, Giuseppe 251
R. H. B. 680

Robinson, Marion 187
Russell, Lilian M.... 429

S. A. 211
S. B. 212, 556, 842
Sarma, D. S. ... 88, 616, 701
Sarma R. Naga Raja ... 642, 775, 849
Schrader, F. Otto 161
Scudder, Vida D. 697
Sencourt, Robert 176
Shelvankar, K. S. 422, 566, 646, 778
Smith, C. E. Hindley 573
Smith, Margaret 520
Stede, W. 563, 844
Stokes, H. N. 66
Strutton, Henry J.... 138, 536, 707
St. John, M. R. 574
Sullivan, J. W. N. 16
S. V. 69, 71

Tavadia, J. C. 217
Thompson, C. J. S. 199
T. L. C. 282
Turner, Dorothy 510

Venkata Rao, M. A. ... 494, 567
Venkateswara, S. V. ... 30, 834

Wadia, A. R. ... 10, 674, 853
Waite, A. E. 711, 845
Ward, Edith ... 143, 279, 560
Watts, Alan W. 261
West, Geoffrey 64, 128, 156, 319, 468, 563, 603, 755
Whiteman, G. W. ... 356, 566, 568
Williams, Cecil 575
W. W. 146, 713
W. W. L. 353, 357, 565

Yamagata, Isoh 334

Ⓐ Ⓤ Ⓜ

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. III. JANUARY 1932 No. 1

CONSCIENCE—THE BRIDGE

The Inner Life is a discipline. From remote antiquity, the culture of consciousness has been regarded as an intimate life-experience. Self-control or self-expression, Second-Birth or Integration, whatever the name—it is an *inner* realization, not a mental recognition. In this lies the stupendous, nay the unbridgeable gulf between the method of acquiring ordinary knowledge and that of acquiring esoteric wisdom which is *sui generis*. What the mind learns it learns by inner experience, not with the help of the outer senses. What the Soul intuits it does by an inner ideation, not dependent on mental reflection. The only process analogous to it in ordinary life is the functioning of the voice of conscience—sometimes valued as the infallible voice of the Soul, whereas it is but the voice of the accumulated experience of the lower or the personal man; and at times the voice of desire and fleshly impulses is mistaken for it. What the voice of conscience is to the human brain and blood, that—and something more—is the voice of the Spiritual Soul to the human heart and the inner invisible sensorium.

The greatest service which conscience renders is not in its protective action which tells us what *not* to do, but in its provocativeness which is a mysterious, silent symbol. Conscience is an awakener, it gives the indication that an inner universe exists. The universe of gods, heroes, geniuses, is glimpsed when we wake up to this second and symbolic aspect of conscience. The lighthouse affords a good comparison: it flashes its message of "don't come near here". The message is ever active and beneficently protective.

But the lighthouse is also a silent symbol—the steady, revolving, and blazing power which tells the sailor what not to do, leaving him to find out, by other means, how to reach his haven of safety. It is self-evident that the lighthouse has a silent and invisible message about the existence of the port and the way thereto.

This double inter-working is the only link between the world of mortals and that of gods, heroes, and geniuses. Conscience is the internal organ, the path or the bridge, between the desire-frought mind of man and his Spirit-illumined Soul. The Divine Ego and the personal self are joined by conscience. From the lower side it stores the innumerable experiences gathered in the world of senses; into the higher it opens the Door to the Holy of Holies. The bridge lies inward, behind and beyond the jungle of the world, and leads to the garden of Eden.

The first requirement for the higher life is that a man should know himself. The starting point of self-knowledge is this internal organ called conscience whose "don'ts" must be heeded and *while heeded must be understood.* The paths are many; Muhammed's description is graphic—there are as many ways to God as there are breaths of the children of men. The conscience-organ represents the evolution of the past; it exists in the foolish as in the wise man; therefore its injunctions and modes of assistance differ for each. But feeble or strong it exists, and *in each it is the starting point.* Its first or protective help which warns us against repetition of old blunders makes for the discipline of ordinary life. The idea of what is proper in life is formulated by conscience which keeps us away from the pit-falls of the soul. Good people mostly live by "don'ts," because they live by the voice of conscience; it is well that they heed that voice, but that is not sufficient; they must probe and ascertain its why and wherefore. "It is not done," is conservatism and orthodoxy; a consideration of why it is not or should not be done liberalizes and then liberates. The higher life is a liberalizing pursuit. It is not merely repetitionary like ordinary life; it cannot be said of it *labitur et labetur.*

The discipline of life reveals ideals—we live in a particular way because we aspire to live up to particular ideals. One's code of morals has a soul and a body—ideals are the Soul, and conduct forms the body. Scientific cultivation of conscience is the very first right step. Why shall a person not lie, nor steal, nor commit adultery? Why is it better to be generous than to be mean; why is it noble to be sympathetic and ignoble to be scornful? Why is cruelty bad and compassion good? These and like questions enable a man to know himself—his virtues and peccabilities. This enquiry leads him to the preparation for Second Birth. Strange as it may sound, there are

illegitimate twice-borns, and we have the phenomenon of the libertine genius, the voluptuary poet, the debauchee and drunkard who creates not in spite of, but because of, debauchery and drink. Eastern Occultism warns—beware of illegitimate ways; they lead to Abaddon.

The legitimate way to the inner life lies through Conscience—the Path of Communication. It is the fearless questioning of one's own beliefs, habits and hopes. We have to free our minds from all the ideas which we may have derived from heredity, from education, from surroundings, or from sundry teachers. This freeing of the mind from the bondage of acquired habits is spoken of in Eastern Occultism as the courting of the Soul, before the betrothal which is followed by the consummation of marriage. The period of courtship is full of adventures, mishaps, happinesses and dejections. It more often brings forth failure, as the rules of the subtle game of Soul-courtship are not observed, mostly because of ignorance, but sometimes because of the spirit of venture or self-opinionatedness or impatience. These three are the dangers in Soul-courtship. Do not be impatient; leave self behind, fight and overcome all obstacles not by spasmodic and fitful ventures, but by steady thinking and steadfast adherence to the rules of this most ancient of games. Just as a man's whole routine of life undergoes a change when he falls in love and goes a-courting, so also the moorings and discipline of life undergo a transformation when the Inner Enchanter is encountered. The glamours of sense, of mental deception, of selfish attachment are seen in their true light; a revision of discipline takes place; new modes of thought and of labour are perceived; above all, the beauty and the truth of things take new values. The result of the whole experience compels the man to give up more than one personal habit, such as practised in ordinary social life, and on the other hand to adopt some few ascetic rules.

. Conscience then is the first step.

THE WAY OF INTUITION

[**Hugh I'A. Fausset** writes on a subject near to his heart—a subject which has been discussed by scientists, philosophers and mystics and which affects the well-being of every one. His arguments and conclusions are reminiscent to a great extent of ideas presented so far back as 1877 by H. P. Blavatsky in her *Isis Unveiled*. We append a few extracts to show this.

Mr. Fausset's view that the western world has become increasingly stricken with a disease which he calls "exclusive and morbid development of one instrument of his being, his intellect," brings to mind a grave warning given in 1880 by a Theosophical Mahatma:—

> The intellectual portion of mankind seems to be fast dividing itself into two classes: the one unconsciously preparing for itself long periods of temporary annihilation or states of non-consciousness, owing to the deliberate surrender of intellect and its imprisonment in the narrow grooves of bigotry and superstition—a process which cannot fail to lead to the utter deformation of the intellectual principle; the other unrestrainedly indulging its animal propensities with the deliberate intention of submitting to annihilation pure and simple, in case of failure, and to millenniums of degradation after physical dissolution.—EDS.]

One of the most notable symptoms of the reaction against the exclusive rationalism of modern science is to be found in the amount of attention which is being given to-day to the faculties of Instinct and Intuition. That the two terms are so frequently and indiscriminately linked together betrays in itself the confused condition in which the Western world finds itself in this age of transition. Yet there is much that is hopeful even in this confusion, not only because there *is* a vital relation between these two faculties, but because the hunger for a more real state of being than the divided consciousness allows, which dictates the attempt to renew and replenish the primary instincts, must ultimately lead to a realisation that the only possible return to nature for self-conscious man is through the unfolding in him and establishment of intuition. When, in short, man has become divided in himself through the exclusive and morbid development of one instrument of his being, his intellect (and the whole Western world since the Renaissance, apart from a few backward regions, has become increasingly stricken with this disease), he reaches eventually a condition of inward death and discord from which either he must be reborn into a new life and consciousness, or die slowly and painfully of a cancerous growth. But for most men it is easier to look back than forward. Hence the number of mentally tortured men, who think with Whitman that they could turn and live with animals. And there is a truth in their desperate recoil from a diseased humanity to the health of the subhuman. For on his unconscious level the animal has unity and it is a spiritual

unity. As a creature he obeys the Creative Will; his instincts are wholly submissive to that Eternal Mind which transcends the human dichotomy of intellect and instinct. But in the animal, as in the plant, that Mind and Will manifest themselves at an elementary level. And it is a level to which no man in whom self-consciousness has awoken can return. In man, as he develops, the creative unity is broken up. He falls into dualism and it is through this dualism that he becomes conscious of himself. But it is not of his true Self, of the eternal I AM, that he at first becomes conscious, but of the instruments of that true Self, his physical and rational faculties. In him the Eternal Mind no longer rules unconsciously the instincts. It evolves instead the intellect as a special function of Itself and one that is complementary to that of instinct. Through the intellect man knows consciously both himself and reality in their material form; through instinct he identifies himself unconsciously with the life spirit, which seeks materialisation. Ideally these two faculties are mutually adapted and necessary to each other. They are, when creatively harmonised, the instruments of the Eternal Spirit potential in all men and purposing through human evolution a completer realisation of Itself. But the necessity of self-knowledge and the freedom of will, which are the conditions of man's advance towards spiritual realisation, involve at first a fall from that elementary state of spiritual unity in which the purely instinctive creature lives. The spiritual bond is weakened, if not broken. *In learning to know himself, man loses the secret of being more than himself.* In discovering and exploring his singularity, he forgets his essential identity, and this both in his own inward being and in his relation to the universe. He is no longer at home in the world nor at peace within himself. If he thinks, his thought is not vitally related to his being, while if he seeks to renew his vitality by a blind surrender to instinct, he finds after repeated failures that such surrender is no longer possible to him. For the intellect which he strives to submerge is tenacious in its resistance. With the subtlety of the serpent it poisons the fruit that he would unthinkingly absorb. It closes against him the channel of either impersonal or super-personal ecstasy, and offers him instead only enervating thrills of pleasure. Because the two faculties of intellect and instinct have become for him material ends, instead of spiritual means, he can only alternate between barren thought and sterile sensation. But a way can be found out of this prison. It is found by some men only when the inward struggle has been so intense and so protracted that they can sustain it no longer. The intolerable tension breaks, or rather they are broken and, no longer able to possess life and themselves through mental asser-

tion or sensuous gratification, they surrender to the Spirit which is beyond human thought and feeling but which can enter into these and fulfil them in unity. This is the way of Conversion, but if it is a true conversion, the sudden moment of surrender is only a starting point. It is a convulsive rebirth out of death into creative life; but the new being may be lost. It must not only be allowed to grow; it must be nourished, shaped, and consolidated. Nor need the prison-walls of self be broken down by such a violent convulsion. That conversion of this kind has been so common in the West, so infrequent in the East, is not so much due, as a recent Christian writer on the subject has suggested, to "low moral standards, apparently acquiesced in by Hinduism and other religions, which weaken the sense of self-value," as to the vicious individualism which the West has mistaken for a true sense of self-value and with which even the Christian churches have been infected. The infrequency in fact of violent conversion in the East has been due in large measure to its deeper spiritual wisdom. The Eastern Sages have not only possessed a finer psychological insight into the laws of being, but they have constantly emphasised the truth, both in their teaching and their practice, that *the spiritual life, like the physical, is one of organic growth through ascending degrees of self-realisation*. The way out of the prison of the lower self need not in fact be one of rupture. It can be a way of knowledge, cultivated, controlled, and directed, so that the faculties of the lower man can be gradually shaped and tempered to fulfil his higher need, to receive and transmit more and more light from the source of all light, until that final stage of illumination is approached in which "we shall know, even as we are known".

This is the way of Intuition. For intuition is not, as it is so generally conceived in the West, a fortuitous and uncontrollable faculty, a happy gift of second-sight. Those flashes of divination which all of us have experienced in moments of exaltation, that dream-like vividness and splendour which invested the world of childhood but too often fades "into the common light of day," were the radiations of an Eternal Sun. The artist who breaks through the conventional ways of looking at things and unveils the reality within is living, at least momentarily, in the light of that Sun; while the whole purpose of the Mystic is so to cultivate his being that in every act and thought and feeling he may radiate that light with a steady constancy.

The fact, however, that the West has begun to realize the significance of intuition as a creative faculty is due less perhaps to the artists or the mystics than to a philosopher. For in the writings of Bergson all those who were reacting against the intellectual self-sufficiency of modern science found a convincing justification. No philosopher has demonstrated with more cogency and charm the relativity of an exclusively intellectual approach to truth. Reality to Bergson is neither solid matter nor thinking mind, but living evolution. It is an unceasing becoming, and we perceive it; not by an intellectual act such as that by which we perceive objects around us and their relations in time and space, but by a direct inner perceiving, an intuition. We know reality by becoming an active centre of this universal flow.

But although Bergson has brilliantly disproved the dualism of matter and mind, while his conception of life as a continual new creation and his insistence that we are free only when our acts spring from our whole personality are finally true, he has never attempted of course to suggest how this intuitive consciousness may be realised. Moreover his conception of "the flow" and the emphasis which he lays upon the process of "becoming" are at times definitely misleading. While doing so much to liberate Western thought from the mechanism of intellect, he has tended to tie it to the vitalism of instinct. Life, he has insisted, is unceasing change. Its apparent immobility is only the temporary equilibrium of incessant action and reaction, as in the electric charges of which the atom consists. Consequently for him duration, change and movement are the whole and only reality, and knowing is a means not an end. It is for the sake of action. The emphasis which Bergson lays upon incessant movement and action as the reality of which all life consists is central to his philosophy. But however satisfactory it is as an explanation of the real nature of the physical world, it seems to me to simplify unduly and dangerously the problem of realising the spiritual life. At least for the individual who would tread the path of intuition it is not enough to say that reality does not lie within us in the mind nor without us in the world of things, but in life. For *Life itself must be evaluated if we are to avoid falling into a merely phenomenal flux*. Life is not ours; it is given to us. In this sense it is the only reality. But according as we condition ourselves to receive the gift, we perceive and manifest its reality. And the purer our response to life becomes, the more disinterestedly we embody it in our consciousness, the more sure we are that change and action are only the outward expression of changelessness and inaction, and that both knowledge and action are ultimately a means to being. Being is the end as it is the origin of all life. From a Spiritual centre we have been born into a revolving universe and our destiny is to return to that centre by realising it in ourselves. And only when we have firmly reëstablished it, when we rest upon it even in our most strenuous actions, can we go out to any point in life's circumference without losing our integrity, or partake of life abundantly without a waste of spirit. It is by recognising and gradually adjusting our

mental and physical faculties to that creative centre of vibrant stillness that we learn the secret of intuition and possess it, not in momentary and tantalising flashes, but as an abiding light. To recognise the Eternal Spirit within us is the first essential. And recognition can only come through an abandonment of egotism with its conflicting faculties of sense and thought, and a reawakening, through inward contemplation, of the essential self which is at one with the spiritual source of all Being and which, when fully awakened, transforms the physical faculties from agents of death into organs of life.

It is thus only through selflessness that the true Self can be realised, and because love, disinterested work, and the desire to understand all involve an abandonment of the lower self, all may lead to and further recognition. Every effort to increase and enhance what is positive in ourselves and to transmute what is negative into a positive quality, relates us more closely to the Creative Spirit and enables it to work more fertilely within us. In this sense every moment of our lives is in reality a new creation, as Bergson writes. But the way of intuition is not a mere surrender to the *élan vital*. It is an expressive concentration of the Eternal Spirit in an individual and finely tempered consciousness, until every impulse springs from this centre, until the knowledge that life and truth are given to us becomes so real that we too desire to possess nothing for ourselves but only to give. To attain to this height of selfhood and selflessness is doubtless beyond most of us. But every gleam of intuition points the way towards it and to that wholeness of being and inner freedom which come of obedience to the creative inspiration of life. For intuition is not an accidental faculty. It is the sum of all other faculties and their coördination in a higher unity. And it may be cultivated and made constant by those who will study the laws which govern it and strive patiently and unceasingly to quicken the Spirit within them.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

Reason, which, as Cabanis says, develops only at the expense and loss of natural instinct, is a Chinese wall slowly rising on the soil of sophistry, and which finally shuts out man's spiritual perceptions of which the instinct is one of the most important examples. Arrived at certain stages of physical prostration, when mind and the reasoning faculties seem paralysed through weakness and bodily exhaustion, instinct—the spiritual *unity* of the five senses—sees, hears, feels, tastes, and smells, unimpaired by either time or space. What do we know of the exact limits of mental action? How can a physician take upon himself to distinguish the imaginary from the real senses in a man who may be living a spiritual life, in a body so exhausted of its usual vitality that it actually is unable to prevent the soul from *oozing* out from its prison?

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Isis Unveiled* I, 145

Macaulay's Blackfoot Indian is more to be trusted than the most instructed and developed reason, as regards man's *inner* sense which assures him of his immortality. Instinct is the universal endowment of nature by the Spirit of the Deity itself; reason the slow development of our physical constitution, an evolution of our adult material brain. Instinct, as a divine spark, lurks in the unconscious nerve-centre of the ascidian mollusk, and manifests itself at the first stage of action of its nervous system as what the physiologist terms the reflex action. It exists in the lowest classes of the acephalous animals as well as in those that have distinct heads; it grows and develops according to the law of the double evolution, physically and spiritually; and entering upon its conscious stage of development and progress in the cephalous species already endowed with a sensorium and symmetrically-arranged ganglia, this reflex action, whether men of action term it *automatic*, as in the lowest species, or *instinctive*, as in the more complex organisms which act under the guidance of the sensorium and the stimulus originating in distinct sensation, is still one and the same thing. It is the *divine instinct* in its ceaseless progress of development. This instinct of the animals, which act from the moment of their birth each in the confines prescribed to them by nature, and which know how, save in accident proceeding from a higher instinct than their own, to take care of themselves unerringly—this instinct may, for the sake of exact definition, be termed automatic; but it must have either within the animal which possesses it or *without*, something's or some one's *intelligence* to guide it.

Ibid. I. 425

Logic shows us that as all matter had a common origin, it must have attributes in common, and as the vital and divine spark is in man's material body, so it must lurk in every subordinate species. The latent mentality which, in the lower kingdoms is recognized as semi-consciousness, consciousness, and instinct, is largely subdued in man. Reason, the outgrowth of the physical brain, develops at the expense of instinct—the flickering reminiscence of a once divine omniscience—spirit. Reason, the badge of the sovereignty of physical man over all other physical organisms, is often put to shame by the instinct of an animal. As his brain is more perfect than that of any other creature, its emanations must naturally produce the highest results of mental action; but reason avails only for the consideration of material things; it is incapable of helping its possessor to a knowledge of spirit. In losing instinct, man loses his intuitional powers which are the crown and ultimatum of instinct. Reason is the clumsy weapon of the scientist—intuition the unerring guide of the seer. Instinct teaches plant and animal their seasons for the procreation of their species, and guides the dumb brute to find his appropriate remedy in the hour of sickness. Reason—the pride of man—fails to check the propensities of his matter, and brooks no restraint upon the unlimited gratification of his senses. Far from leading him to be his *own* physician, its subtile sophistries lead him too often to his own destruction.

Ibid. I. 433

Like everything else which has its origin in psychological mysteries, instinct has been too long neglected in the domain of science. "We see what indicated the way to man to find relief for all his physical ailings," says Hippocrates. "It is the instinct of the earlier races, when cold reason had not as yet obscured man's inner vision. . . . . Its indication must never be disdained, for it is to instinct alone that we owe our first remedies." Instantaneous and unerring cognition of an omniscient mind, instinct is in everything unlike the finite reason; and in the tentative progress of the latter, the god-like nature of man is often utterly engulfed, whenever he shuts out from himself the divine light of intuition. The one crawls, the other flies; reason is the power of the man, intuition the prescience of the woman!

Ibid. I. 434

THE STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY IN INDIA TO-DAY

[**Professor A. R. Wadia**, President of the Indian Philosophical Congress is the Director of Public Instruction in the progressive Indian state ruled by the deservedly respected Maharaja of Mysore.

Our readers will do well to read our Editorial Notes in THE ARYAN PATH of February and of October 1931; for, our author examines and criticises views presented there in this able article. We cannot attempt a full answer here, and further, before doing so ourselves, we should like to see the subject discussed by others of the same distinction as our author, and with the same judicious reasoning.—EDS.]

Philosophy is generally regarded as too technical a subject to interest the general reader, and proceedings of philosophical congresses are apt to be passed by in silence. Hence the interest evinced by the editors of THE ARYAN PATH in the presidential addresses at the last session of the All India Philosophical Congress is all the more encouraging and prompts me to write on the study of philosophy in India to-day.

If philosophy means love of truth and a man in the East *qua* man does not differ from a man in the the West, it follows that philosophy can know no geographical limitations. Philosophy by its very essence must be universal or it ceases to be philosophy. When we talk of Indian philosophy and European philosophy it cannot mean that there is one philosophic truth in India and another in Europe. The difference can only be in this, that the former has been developed by Indians and the latter by Europeans. The truth in either must be universal, and given opportunities of contact there is bound to be reciprocal influence. It is, however, true that a difference in environment and a difference in history leave behind their traces even on so universal a subject as philosophy or religion.

I

There are a few well marked differences between philosophy as developed in India and in Europe. The first difference is to be found in the method of approach to philosophical problems. It was India's good fortune that very early in her philosophic career the Upanishads came to be developed and have served as a veritable reservoir of inspiration to all succeeding generations. To determine their exact date is a task well nigh impossible. But it has been recognised by even the orthodox that they did not see the light of day all at the same time or that they all are the work of one mind. They have grown silently and imperceptibly, as things in India will grow, for the lure of historical immortality does not play any great part in the Hindu mind. They have sprung from different minds separated at times by centuries. Under the very circumstances of their birth they were bound to be different in their contents, and it is certainly doubtful if they present as unified a system of thought as the editorial comments in THE ARYAN PATH seem to imply. It is equally true that the Upanishads do not present a closely reasoned-out system of thought. They are rather the deliverances of advanced souls, as much mystical and poetical as philosophical. They constitute a mine of profound truths, which a seeker after truth will not find ready-made, but will have to travail for through years of striving.

The very greatness of the Upanishads has prevented a free growth of philosophic thought. They have carried their authority through the ages and no first rate Indian thinker has dared to go beyond them. They and the *Gita* have become the alpha and omega of Indian thought. Even intellectual giants like Sankara and Ramanuja have been content to develop their thought in the humble guise of mere commentaries on the old inherited wealth of Upanishadic experience. This has given a certain unity to the history of philosophy in India, for Vedanta has been the only live force for centuries, while other systems of thought had their brief span of existence and live only in books. This has not been altogether an advantage for India. The time when the Samkya and the Mimamsas and the Buddhistic schools, and even the atheistic Charvakas flourished showed that there was living thought in India. People then had the courage to think and start new lines of thought. But once Vedanta became supreme, the freshness of philosophic endeavour lost its edge and philosophy became dogmatic till it has now become a matter of inheritance like goods and chattels.

European philosophy started with very humble beginnings. Nobody developed a cut and dried system of thought. Its very puerility in Thales and his like stimulated thought generation after generation, till the endeavours of some three centuries blossomed forth in the triune genius of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. They have stamped on all European philosophy three distinctive features. First, an uncompromising challenge to all authority as such. Man shall think. Reason shall be his only guide, and in the history of pure thought Socrates has been the greatest martyr. Secondly: the search after truth shall be supreme; truth before friendship, declared Aristotle, and it continues a living truth in Europe even to-day. Thirdly: the love of truth shall not estrange any man from his duty to living men. Plato laid a burden on the philosophers of his *Republic* that they shall not lose themselves in their selfish enjoyment of knowledge, but that they shall return to the world and be prepared to give the benefit of their knowledge to their fellow men. And yet practical considerations were not to affect the ideal of knowledge for the sake of knowledge. The fruits of knowledge may be shared by all, but the pursuit of knowledge has to be

disinterested, has to be just for itself. That is why in Europe a number of most important discoveries have been made in a most casual fashion. The scientist of to-day, as the philosopher of every age, has only one aim: Knowledge. Hence, while in India the approach to philosophy has been for several centuries from the standpoint of intuited truth as formulated in the Upanishads and the *Gita*, the approach to philosophy in Europe has been through the reason of the individual bent on discovering knowledge through a disinterested pursuit of it. Knowledge for the sake of knowledge: that has been the guiding inspiration in the West. It is here that we find the second most profound difference between the thought of India and of Europe.

The European philosophers have always aimed at knowledge: their main purpose has been to understand the universe. The Indian philosopher has aimed at *mukti*, which has been generally translated into English as realisation. The European temperament on the whole has been a joyous one except where the Christian sense of suffering has been emphasised by the mystics or a stray thinker like Schopenhauer. It has believed that the world on the whole has been worth living in, and as it has not accepted the theory of karma—exceptions apart—there has been in them no incentive to be rid of the cycle of births and deaths. It is content just to know more and more of the secrets of the universe, including Deity or the Absolute. To know, to understand: that is the sum and substance of the philosophic venture in the West. It is this attitude which leaves even the most earnest Indian student of Western philosophy somewhat cold and positively discontented, for through the ages he has wanted something much more concrete than mere knowledge from a study of philosophy. In other words philosophy in India is not merely speculative, it is essentially pragmatic, not in the American sense of what works in this work-a-day world, but in the sense of what works in terms of eternal liberation.

From these distinctively different approaches to philosophy there arises a third vital difference which manifests itself in the opposed attitudes of philosophy to religion in Europe and in India. From the beginning of European philosophy the Greek temperament in its unaided effort to think came into sharp conflict with the mythological religion of the populace. Very early Xenophanes had the courage to write:—

> Yes, and if oxen and horses or lions had hands, and could paint with their hands, and produce works of art as men do, horses would paint the forms of the gods like horses, and oxen like oxen, and make their bodies in the image of their several kinds.
>
> The Ethiopians make their gods black and snub-nosed; the Thracians say theirs have blue eyes and red hair.

In the spirit of a philosopher he wrote about "one God, the greatest amongst gods and men, neither in form like unto mortals nor in thought". This conflict came to a head in Socrates. In his struggle against the lascivious in the religion of his day he died a martyr to the spirit of philosophy, so gloriously immortalised by Plato in his *Apology*. To this spirit philosophy in Europe has kept true except in the Middle Ages when philosophy was content to play second fiddle to religion, but a religion not debased as in Greece, but as exalted as religion can be within the limits of a highly organised church. Thinkers like Bacon and Descartes and Leibnitz and even Locke thought it best to keep on the right side of the forces of religion, but in the course of their thought they disdained to base their arguments on the dogmas of the Church. With the growth of toleration and a spirit of free inquiry in many cases philosophers have boldly gone their way, whether their teaching made religion possible or impossible. Freedom of thought may produce its free thinkers and its atheists, but they were men bold and fearless in the pursuit of what they conceived to be truth. It was not for nothing that J. S. Mill earned the title of the Saint of Rationalism and gained the respect of so avowedly narrow a churchman as Gladstone. But it would be a mistake to imagine, as many do in their ignorance, that Western philosophy is all atheism or materialism. It has its spiritual peaks. It has its prophets who by their thought have elevated mankind—I say mankind advisedly for recently their thought has affected, apart from Europe and America, not merely India but even free countries like Japan and China, Turkey and Persia.

In India philosophy has grown out of religion as embodied in the Vedas, of which the Upanishads are taken to be a part. Philosophy taking the form of a commentary on the Vedas shares in the religious character of the Vedas. Apparently there is no room for conflict and if ever the conclusions of philosophy have tended to militate against the cherished religious convictions of the orthodox masses as in Sankara, the conflict has not taken an open form, for it has been nullified by the esoteric view of philosophic truth as something so sacred that it can be looked in the face only by the *élite*, who have by a long series of births so developed their *atman* that they alone have the *adhikara* to rise above religion and be pure philosophers. It is he, the *gnyani*, that by his intuition can bear witness to the inner meaning of the Upanishadic or Gitaic truth, which lies embedded beneath crusts of ritual and formulæ. Not reason, but intuition becomes the instrument for the discovery of the highest truth.

II

The discerning cannot fail to see the strong points and weak points of European and Indian philosophy alike. In the former there is an overweening faith in the capacity of reason to solve all problems. This has had the defect that many have confined reason

to the domain of the material and have deliberately clipped its wings so that it dare not soar beyond the physical. Even among those, who are known as Idealists, there is just a belief in Deity or in the Absolute. In India on the other hand all materialism has been driven out, but philosophy has become stereotyped, dogmatic. Seers talk of their intuitions, but the intuitions of the Advaitin, Visista-advaitin and the Dvaitin differ so radically as to make an appeal to reason absolutely inevitable. Reason may be scoffed at, but in the last resort it is the only barrier against superstitions, dogmatisms, and even intuitions. Emphasise mere intuition and you open the flood-gates of quackery and charlatanism. And who will deny that the soul of India has been poisoned through the ages by the uncritical worship of the saffron robe and surrender of reason to the dogmatism of seers as of theologies? For one Ramakrishna of gold there are a thousand pinchbeck sadhus, who thrive on the sweat and the credulity of the masses.

Philosophy in India had come to that stage when it had become stagnant: the same old problems, the same old answers went their weary way through centuries. Conquerors came and went. India changed, but her changing needs met no response from philosophy except to smother all disquieting questions by dismissing empires and exploitation and poverty alike as mere maya: in eternity time does not matter. Is the notoriously benumbing poverty of India the result of this philosophy, as is generally supposed, or is this philosophy the result of dire poverty, as Dr. Will Durant will have us believe? Whichever view is correct it is not possible to be blind to the fact that India is poor and a beggar in the comity of nations. If philosophy can contribute its mite to a change for the better, should it not do so? But where is the energy to come from? It has been supplied by the West, and not the least potent force in this is the Western emphasis on reason, which with all its limitations is yet the only solvent of all the accretions of centuries.

III

Universities in India have admittedly been very imperfect instruments of culture, but with all their faults they have opened out new visions which, but for them, would not have helped to create a new India. The exclusive emphasis on western culture which our universities till lately enforced had at least the effect of shaking up our lethargy, and European philosophy in all its phases has created a new zest for thought which is finding vent in the All India Philosophical Congress. Considering the soil from which it has sprung there is nothing surprising in its conscious and unconscious emphasis on western modes of thought, especially at a time when the East and the West are but relative terms in their physical and cultural import. The editors of this journal plead for a place for the

pundits in the fold of the Philosophical Congress. After all the frank admission of the shortcomings of the Punditic mind that the editors themselves have made, what is left of their importance to the Congress? Nothing but massive learning, dogmatic and uncritical. They have their use. The discerning will tap them as valuable sources of information and knowledge, but in themselves unless and until they pass through the purgatory of fearless criticism of their dogmas at the hands of reason they have no place as thinkers. But I entirely appreciate the zeal of the editors for Indian thought, and in fact this was the burden of my presidential address last year. The Congress has great work to do in the resuscitation of the time-honoured Indian genius for thought, and reviving or establishing truths not as dead formulæ, but as living truths.

A. R. WADIA

The reasonableness of *Conscious* Existence can be proved only by the study of the primeval—now esoteric—philosophy. And it says "there is neither death nor life, for both are illusions; being (or *be-ness*) is the only reality." This paradox was repeated thousands of ages later by one of the greatest physiologists that ever lived. "Life is Death" said Claude Bernard. The organism lives because its parts are ever dying. The survival of the fittest is surely based on this truism. The life of the superior whole requires the death of the inferior, the death of the parts depending on and being subservient to it. And, as life is death, so death is life, and the whole great cycle of lives form but ONE EXISTENCE—*the worst day of which is on our planet.* He who KNOWS will make the best of it. For there is a dawn for every being, when once freed from illusion and ignorance by Knowledge; and he will at last proclaim in truth *and all Consciousness* to Mahamaya:—

"BROKEN THY HOUSE IS, AND THE RIDGE-POLE SPLIT!
DELUSION FASHIONED IT!
SAFE PASS I THENCE—DELIVERANCE TO OBTAIN."

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Lucifer*. Vol. I, p. 119

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF SCIENCE

THOUGHTS ON THE CENTENARY CELEBRATION

[**J. W. N. Sullivan** plays an important part in popularizing abstruse and difficult scientific theories and ideas for the British public. Among his books, *Three Men Discuss Relativity; Aspects of Science: Second Series; Galileo or The Tyranny of Science*, have attracted much attention. *The Contemporary Mind* will be published shortly.

In the following article he deals with the trend of modern science which, as our readers will see, is in the direction of Theosophy and Occultism. In that connection we draw their attention to a letter from a qualified scientist who has culled from H. P. B.'s *Secret Doctrine* telling and thought-provoking quotations to show how she wrote over fifty years ago what General Smuts puts forth as the most recent findings of Modern Science.—EDS.]

The last hundred years has witnessed the greatest change in the scientific outlook that has taken place since the time of Newton. Indeed, it is the greatest change that has ever taken place since science became a coherent and definite body of thought. The typically materialistic scientific outlook has always been based chiefly on the science of physics. Astronomy, by demonstrating the material insignificance of the earth, has also contributed an element, and the biological theory of evolution, in its attempt to show that man might have originated and developed by a mechanical and purposeless process, also played a very important part in the formation of scientific materialism. But the chief backing of this theory was always provided by the science of physics. The idea that matter is the sole ultimate reality, and that the universe is strictly determined—the "iron laws" of the Victorians—arose from the science of physics. Other sciences were not in a position to demonstrate the exact correspondences that determinism required. The fact that the change that has come over the scientific outlook is due precisely to physics, is, therefore, of fundamental importance. The new ideas do not originate from some shadowy borderland of scientific speculation; they originate in the very heart of the severest and most exact of the sciences.

In considering the change that has come over science during the last hundred years it happens to be quite convenient to go back exactly one hundred years, and to start with Faraday's discovery of electro-magnetic induction in 1831. The essential characteristic of Faraday's achievement, from our present point of view, was that he showed that so-called empty space is an active and important agent in the scientific scheme. The mathematicians of Faraday's time believed that electrical effects were produced by "action at a distance". An electrified body was supposed to influence another body at a

distance "directly". Space merely played the rôle of separating the bodies. Gravitation, then and for long afterwards, was supposed to act in a similar way. But to Faraday space was not a mere vacuity; he saw it as a medium uniting the two bodies and transmitting the electrical effects from one to the other. In his imagination it was filled with "lines of force," with stresses and strains. A so-called "isolated" electrified body, according to Faraday, influences the whole of space.

For some time the mathematicians ignored Faraday's profound vision. This was partly due to the fact that he expressed himself in unorthodox language, for Faraday was entirely ignorant of mathematical technique. He could not, himself, give his ideas mathematical expression. But in the same year that Faraday discovered electromagnetic induction James Clerk Maxwell was born, a mathematician who had an imagination akin to Faraday's own. In 1856, when Maxwell was twenty-five, he gave his first mathematical interpretation of Faraday's ideas. Subsequent development, where these ideas were investigated ever more profoundly, culminated in his enunciation of the electromagnetic theory of light, the greatest physical discovery of the nineteenth century. It was established that electric and magnetic effects are propagated from point to point through space, that these effects are propagated in the form of waves, that these waves travel with the velocity of light, and that light itself is one particular form of these waves. Maxwell died before the scientific world realised what he had done. Some years later, in 1886, Hertz succeeded in experimentally producing Maxwell's electromagnetic waves. As a bye-product of this research we have wireless telegraphy and telephony.

The problem of "space" now became acute. Already, before the period we have been considering, it had been accepted that space is filled with an "ether," a sort of material medium stretching to the farthest star. This medium was invented in order to explain the propagation of light. But now that light had been shown to be an electromagnetic phenomenon, the whole question had to be investigated anew. The old ether theory was shown to be unsatisfactory. Entirely new ethers were designed, but none of them could be made to work. The problem of the ether threatened to be insoluble. This was the state of affairs when Einstein published his first Relativity paper in 1905. At one stroke he resolved all the difficulties—or, rather, showed that men of science had been concerning themselves with pseudo-problems,—but only at the cost of revolutionising our ideas of space and time. Space and time, it now appeared, are merely aspects of a more fundamental reality. This reality, in technical phraseology, is the four-dimensional continuum. Neither space nor time exists separately and "objectively" in Nature. They

are man-made to the extent that observers with different motions split up the four-dimensional reality, which is always one and the same, into different spaces and times. The further development of this theory reveals to us an ever more abstract world. Not only space and time, but even matter, are seen to be aspects of the four-dimensional continuum. If these further developments are confirmed it will appear that, so far as the material universe is concerned, the four-dimensional continuum is the one reality, and that everything else arises as a consequence of the mind's selective action on this raw material.

We see that a great change has taken place. The analysis of space has led, as one consequence, to the dethronement of matter from its position as a fundamental, *ultimate* reality. But a second great line of research can be traced through the last hundred years and we shall see that a somewhat similar position has been reached by the direct analysis of matter itself. The theory that matter consists of atoms, each chemical element having its own kind of atom, had been put forth as a definite scientific theory early in the nineteenth century. These atoms were regarded as small, hard, and probably spherical particles—the ultimate, simple units out of which all matter is built. But even as early as 1864 there were indications that the atoms were not so simple. Curious similarities between various chemical elements roused the suspicion that atoms have a structure, and that they are constructed on some sort of recurrent plan. This suspicion remained a suspicion until 1895.

Between 1895 and 1900 took place that extraordinary series of experimental researches which have completely revolutionized our ideas of matter. By passing an electric discharge through a vacuum tube the existence was demonstrated of tiny electrified bodies nearly two thousand times smaller than the lightest known atom—the hydrogen atom. It was immediately conjectured that these tiny electrified bodies, called electrons, were the ultimate constituents of matter. During the same period X-rays were discovered, and Radium, with its marvellous and unprecedented properties, was isolated. The ground was prepared for the construction of the modern electrical theory of matter. It is this theory that takes us into the most interesting and the most baffling regions of modern science, and which has necessitated a complete revolution in the scientific outlook.

The first shock came when it was found that the electrons were *nothing but* electricity! They were not little particles of "ordinary" matter carrying electric charges—they were little particles of electricity. Since matter is built up of electrons, it follows that matter is electricity. This was a difficult idea to grasp. It seemed to rob matter of all substantiality. We had to make our notions of matter more abstract. The notion of "substance" had to

be replaced by the notion of "behaviour". Anything that behaved like matter was matter. A further shock was experienced when it was found that the electrons in the interior of an atom do not obey the established laws of nature. It was found, however, that the electrons do obey the extraordinary and enigmatic laws of the Quantum Theory, deduced from the phenomena of heat radiation by Planck in 1900. These laws cannot be "understood" but they can be used for the purposes of calculation. On the basis of these laws it seemed that science could now give in a formal and mathematical fashion, at any rate, a detailed description of the structure of the atom. This hope proved to be illusory. Experiment did not confirm calculation. Within the last three or four years entirely new and very strange concepts have had to be introduced. Matter, instead of being the solid, substantial, familiar object of experience, turns out to be the most elusive entity with which science has ever concerned itself.

The ultimate constituent of matter, the electron, seems to possess, at one and the same time, two contradictory properties. It is both a wave and a particle. In certain experiments it behaves as a particle; in other experiments it behaves as a system of waves. It has been suggested that the aspect of the electron as a particle is merely the way our mind translates its nature as a wave system—analogous to the way we translate the molecular vibrations of a hot body into the sensation of hotness. But this suggestion, difficult enough in itself, becomes still more difficult when we examine in detail the wave theory of matter. For it appears that every electron requires a three-dimensional space to itself. Two electrons cannot exist in a space of less than six dimensions; three electrons require nine dimensions, and so on. It seems impossible to take these multi-dimensional spaces seriously. Yet *experiment* shows that electrons have the characteristics of wave systems. It seems evident that science has here stumbled on results that it cannot yet make into a coherent system. Matter, at present, baffles comprehension. Perhaps some further extraordinary revision of our notions of space and time will be necessary before the nature of matter can be understood.

Another, and very important result, that has emerged from this recent analysis, is the so-called Uncertainty Principle. It states, briefly, that strict causality cannot be established for the ultimate processes of nature. We can never, by means of observations, show that the universe is strictly determined. The reason for this is that the mere act of observing these processes interferes with them in an unpredictable way. If, therefore, nature is strictly determined, we shall never be able to discover it. Is there any advantage, then, in postulating strict determinism? Some scientific men not only reject an undiscoverable determinism, but

insist that something like free-will must be put at the basis of natural phenomena.

It will be seen that the change that has come over the scientific outlook is truly fundamental. At the beginning of our hundred years it was generally held that matter, space and time were the fundamental realities and that the universe was strictly determined. We now know that neither matter, space, nor time are fundamental. Science is in touch with a reality that lies behind them, but science tells us nothing of the nature of this reality. All it can do, in its mathematical language, is to tell us something about its structure. And even the doctrine of causality, the leading principle of science from its beginning, is now in process of being abandoned. The last hundred years has witnessed by far the greatest revolution that has ever occurred in scientific thought.

J. W. N. SULLIVAN

So far as Science remains what in the words of Prof. Huxley it is, viz., "organized common sense"; so far as its inferences are drawn from accurate premises—its generalizations resting on a purely inductive basis—every Theosophist and Occultist welcomes respectfully and with due admiration its contributions to the domain of cosmological law. There can be no possible conflict between the teachings of occult and so-called exact Science, where the conclusions of the latter are grounded on a substratum of unassailable fact. It is only when its more ardent exponents, over-stepping the limits of observed phenomena in order to penetrate into the arcana of Being, attempt to wrench the formation of Kosmos and its *living* Forces from Spirit, and attribute all to blind matter, that the Occultists claim the right to dispute and call in question their theories. Science cannot, owing to the very nature of things, unveil the mystery of the universe around us. Science can, it is true, collect, classify, and generalize upon phenomena; but the occultist, arguing from admitted metaphysical data, declares that the daring explorer, who would probe the inmost secrets of Nature, must transcend the narrow limitations of sense, and transfer his conclusions into the region of noumena and the sphere of primal causes. To effect this, he must develop faculties which are absolutely dormant—save in a few rare and exceptional cases—in the constitution of the off-shoots of our present Fifth Root-race in Europe and America. He can in no other conceivable manner collect the facts on which to base his speculations. Is this not apparent on the principles of Inductive Logic and Metaphysics alike?

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Secret Doctrine* I, 477–8

THE LIFE OF THE SOUL ACCORDING TO JESUS

[**Benjamin Wisner Bacon, D. D., Litt. D. (Oxon)**, is a veteran theologian who has been publishing books and contributing to periodicals on his special subject for forty years. Since 1897 he has been Professor of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis at Yale University. Our contributor is undoubtedly profoundly learned in the science of words and the deciphering of documents,—but there is something more; and we would not have our readers forget that there is a hidden side to the Gospels. In this connection we draw their attention to a series of articles which appeared in *Lucifer* (Nov. and Dec. 1887, Feb. 1888), from the pen of Madame H. P. Blavatsky, entitled "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels".—EDS.]

The question before us hinges almost exclusively upon another, a question of sources: What value are we to give to the Fourth Gospel in comparison with the other three called Synoptic, which in both elements, teaching and narrative, represent all we have of report derived at first or second hand from the Apostle Peter?

The Fourth Gospel, traditionally ascribed to the Apostle John, is anonymous, late, and dependent. There still remain, however, some conservative scholars, such as the veteran Zahn, who continue to maintain that this tradition of apostolic authorship (to the assertion of which the Fourth Gospel owes its acceptance to canonical standing) must be given consideration. Few indeed continue to assert that the evangelist's aim is to present historically the actual remembered sayings and doings of Jesus. All who to any extent have felt the pressure of modern critical argument admit that with the afflatus the Apostle, (if indeed in any real sense the author) had become, through lapse of years and changed environment at the close of the first century or beginning of the second, "another man". The evangelist is aiming not so much to report what he remembers Jesus to have said as to weave into more or less artificial dialogue with "the Jews" what Jesus *might* have said and done to meet the objections and heresies of the post-apostolic age.

In the Synoptic Gospels there is scarcely anything in which Jesus takes less concern than "the life of the soul". In the Fourth Gospel there is no subject in which he is more deeply concerned. If we rely mainly on Petrine tradition we shall conclude that a main element in Jesus' teaching was "Take no thought for your life (soul)." "Whosoever seeks to save his life (soul) loses it; whosoever is ready to lose his life (soul) for my sake and the gospel's shall save it." If we rely mainly on Johannine (?) tradition we shall conclude that the main object of Jesus' coming into the world was to reveal the true nature of "life" (meaning "the life of the soul" in distinction from mere bodily existence); and that the incarnation of himself as pre-existent Source of life was in order that believers might have it, have it in greater abundance, and have it eternally.

Before attempting to solve the question of what Jesus thought of the life of the soul one must first decide which of these two utterly irreconcilable representations of his teaching one will accept; or, if one insists upon according some degree of credibility to each, on what grounds the one or the other shall be preferred, and to what extent.

The verdict of critical opinion is not in doubt. By general consent Petrine tradition, however modified by adaptation to the needs of religious edification on various sermonic occasions (primeval tradition acknowledges this propensity), does aim to be true to historic fact. To what extent this can be said of Johannine tradition (if the Fourth Gospel be in any sense of the word "Johannine") is very much in dispute. To take it as reflecting to any appreciable extent the actual sayings of Jesus on its favourite theme of the life of the soul would violate every canon of historical judgment, especially when Synoptic (Petrine) tradition is so emphatic in declaring that Jesus always put first the social ideal of "the Kingdom (sovereignty) of God," and demanded the unconditional subordination to it of every personal interest including life itself. In contrast with this the Fourth Gospel never mentions "the kingdom of God" but once throughout its entire extent, and then only to say that something else is to be put first, *viz.*, "new birth from the Spirit". Without this, says Jesus to the Pharisee Nicodemus, no man can "see the kingdom of God".

Petrine tradition, as reported in the Gospel of Mark, our oldest and most reliable source, also depicts Jesus as confronted with the supreme question of the Pharisee: "What shall I do to have (soul) life?" A young man of great possessions comes running, kneeling to him to ask this all important question, hoping for some new rule of conduct by which the heavenly reward of "a share in the world to come" may be insured. Jesus offers no insurance of it at all. Not even renunciation of all one's possessions, not even the martyrdom faced by those who have taken up the cross will guarantee it. The future lies wholly in God's hands. The young man will be welcomed into the group of disciples on their way to Calvary if he will follow this advice: "Go, sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and come, follow me." But that was not the Pharisee's idea of "eternal life".

Again, just before Calvary itself, Jesus is asked by the Sadducees concerning the Pharisees' hope of resurrection and the "life (of the soul) to come". He rejects the crudities of current apocalyptic teaching to fall back upon the Mosaic hope of a "kingdom of God". God did not bring Israel out of Egypt in order to reign like Pluto over a world of the dead. His promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to be a God to their seed meant a living relation of persons to living persons. Jesus shared to this extent in the

Pharisees' hope for a life (of the soul) to come. He believed in "the kingdom of God". Just how much was implied in this belief he never undertook to say. Striking indeed is the contrast between his reverent silence regarding those heavenly rewards the righteous may expect in "the world to come" and the volubility of the apocalyptic writers. "Lo, we have left all and followed thee, what then shall we have?" clamour the twelve. The answer is "There is no man that has left all for my sake and the gospel's sake but shall receive a hundredfold *now, in this time*—together with persecutions—and in the world to come eternal life." But if we ask, Just what is implied in "eternal life"? there is no better answer than the Farewell to "his own" depicted by the fourth evangelist in his fourteenth chapter, the heart of "the heart of Christ". One would like to believe that there is more than devout imagination in that gentle deprecation "If it were not so I would have told you," wherewith apocalyptic dreams of the "many mansions" in the Father's house are set aside. Positive rejection of the Synoptic apocalypse, with its doom of Jerusalem and last assize, appears in Jesus' answer to Judas (not Iscariot) when he asks, "Lord, what is come to pass that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us and not unto the world?" In spite of the late date and Hellenistic propensities of this Ephesian evangelist one would like to believe that he is truly reflecting that doctrine of Inwardness which even in Synoptic teaching dominates Jesus' thought of the coming "kingdom (sovereignty) of God". If the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer mean anything it is that in all Jesus' thought and action he "sought first the kingdom of God" and lived as he prayed "Thy kingdom come". This social ideal meant to him not externalities but the doing of the Father's will on earth even as it is done in heaven. It was first of all "within you". And Paul, oldest and best of witnesses, gives us reason to believe that to Jesus the kingdom of God was indeed "not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Spirit of consecration". Perhaps then the Ephesian evangelist, follower of Apollos and Paul a generation later, has after all not gone so far astray in his attempt to depict the heart of the heart of Christ.

But we must return to our oldest and most authentic record. Mark knows neither Sermon on the Mount nor Lord's Prayer, yet he shows no less clearly than the underlying teaching source employed by Luke and the relatively late and Jewish-Christian First Gospel, how completely Jesus' thought of soul-life was dominated by this one principle: Inward control of the Father's will. At the very end of Jesus' public teaching Mark tells of a scribe who asked Jesus to define the essence of the Law. Jesus answered with the simplest teaching of Jewish religion, the Shem'a—utter, unreserved, unqualified, willing devotion to God

and His divine purpose for the world. To this as his summary of religion Jesus added his summary of ethics: Brotherly service to our fellow men. Mark's witness to the Recollections of Peter is very simple but sufficient. Whatever we conclude regarding Jesus' thought as to the life of the soul must be dominated, if we reason as historical critics, by this simple testimony. Jesus' one purpose was to achieve the sovereignty of his Father in heaven upon the earth. But he thought of that divine sovereignty as chiefly concerning the life of the soul.

B. W. BACON

The Gnostic Records contained the epitome of the chief scenes enacted during the mysteries of Initiation, since the memory of man; though even that was given out invariably under the garb of semi-allegory, whenever entrusted to parchment or paper. But the ancient Tanaïm, the Initiates from whom the wisdom of the Kabala (*oral tradition*) was obtained by the later Talmudists, had in their possession the secrets of the mystery language, and it is *in this language that the Gospels* were written. Thus while the three Synoptics display a combination of the pagan Greek and Jewish symbologies, the *Revelation* is written in the mystery language of the Tanaïm—the relic of Egyptian and Chaldean wisdom—and St. John's Gospel is purely Gnostic. He alone who has mastered the esoteric cypher of antiquity—the secret meaning of the numerals, a common property at one time of all nations—has the full proof of the genius which was displayed in the blending of the purely Egypto-Jewish, Old Testament allegories and names, and those of the pagan-Greek Gnostics, the most refined of all the mystics of that day.

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Lucifer* Vol. I, p. 493

FROM AUTHORITY TO INSPIRATION

[**Lawrence Hyde** is the author of two remarkable books: *The Learned Knife, An Essay on Science and Human Values* (1928) and *The Prospects of Humanism* (1931). He is at present engaged on a third volume, dealing with the problem of Modern Religion.

In this article our author may be said to be chronicling the net result of the religious struggle of the last fifty years. It should be noted that in the eighties of the last century H. P. Blavatsky saw transpiring what Mr. Hyde records has now taken place *viz.*, (1) the rejection of the church tribunal or its equivalent in the East as final authority in matters of morals and of social life; (2) the tendency to refer all individual or collective actions at the bar of the Self or God within.

Something more was and is being taught by Theosophy—not to mistake emotional impulse for spiritual intuition, the sensing of the invisible for the understanding of both visible and invisible. The teaching was imparted that there exists an ancient body of knowledge, a philosophy consistent in all its propositions, which may be used as a gauge, a measuring-rod, to evaluate one's own mystic, subjective, and inner experiences. No genuine mystic worth his name can or will overlook that his own subjective experiences may delude him, any more than a trained scientist can or will overlook the possibility that his eyesight may prove deceptive. Every subjective and mystic experience is no more fortuitous than the Cosmos is the fortuitous concurrence of forces. Law operates everywhere. Effects, understood or baffling, have their causes, perceived by or unfathomable to, human intelligence. Thus the true mystic checks, verifies and confirms his own experiences by those of others, and especially by the light of the Body of Knowledge above referred to.

This is a new phase which the religio-psychological world is now fast entering upon. Just as there is verifiable knowledge about matter, so is there verifiable knowledge about Spirit. Thus the arbitrary distinction between Occultism and Mysticism to which our author refers vanishes.—EDS.]

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that at the beginning of the present century the religious life of the world entered upon a new phase. The forces which had been operative throughout the previous cycle lost their potency; the spiritual consciousness of the race became quickened with a new life; the foundations were laid for an altogether new Dispensation.

On this point the great majority of sensitive and imaginative people to-day find themselves in substantial agreement. But as to the precise nature of the change which was involved, few are able to speak with any real confidence. And this comprehensibly enough, for we are still only at the dawn of the new era.

Certain broad issues, however, are already fairly clearly defined. It is evident that in the light of the findings of modern Science a large number of our traditional beliefs must be rejected as being henceforward untenable. There are others, on the contrary, which are proving to be based upon a more profound insight into the nature of reality than that of the materialistic thinking by which in appearance they are discredited. For just as valid science sweeps

away the conclusions of false religion, so also does valid religion sweep away the conclusions of false science. Again, there are certain aspects of religious experience which seem to have become of peculiar significance to us only in the present age: witness our steadily growing interest in the phenomena of spiritualism and the occult. But the really *central* element in the twentieth-century situation would seem to be our marked tendency to transfer the seat of authority in religion from without to within. Dean Inge has written that "the real trend of religion among the younger generation is away from dogmatic and institutional Christianity, and towards an individual and personal faith resting not on authority but on experience".* There can be little doubt that what is true of Christianity is true also of all other established religions.

II

Perhaps the most notable manifestation of this disposition is to be found in the growth of the scientific spirit. But this is not at first sight obviously apparent. For the attitude of modern Science is distinguished before everything by its insistence on objectivity. The whole aim of your physicist, your chemist, your astronomer, is to get away from mere subjective judgments and establish the truth on the plane of concrete fact. He has a deep distrust of impressionism, inspiration, transcendentalism; his aim is to lift the whole situation above the plane of the personal altogether. Yet it is no less plain that from another point of view he is an out-and-out subjectivist. For, as has been frequently pointed out, the appeal which he makes is in the end to the private judgment of the individual. He does not, like his medieval precursors, say that certain laws must be operative because the principles of metaphysics demand it, or because Aristotle once laid down that they existed. What he says is that every person, provided only he is properly instructed, may verify the facts for himself. And if any individual, after undertaking such verification, disputes his claims, he is willing to modify his original judgment. In a word, Science ultimately takes its stand upon that which is "common to all (duly qualified) observers," *i. e.*, on a consensus of private judgments. It admits no evidence which is not available for inspection by all. Its standards are essentially *democratic*—however true it may be that in practice only a small minority are capable of putting the experts' conclusions to the test.

This resolute determination to democratize knowledge has naturally had a profound effect upon the character of modern religious thought. The rise of modern science was fatal to the ascendancy of the Medieval Church: he who repudiates external authority in one sphere will very soon be impelled to

* *Assessments and Anticipations*, 1929, p. 83.

do so in every other as well. So it was inevitable that the attempt of the Reformers to discover an external authority in the Bible should speedily fail, and that the consistent Protestant should in the end find himself thrown back upon his own private and personal interpretation of Scripture. And when finally a ruthlessly logical minority had brought themselves to face the fact that it is ultimately the individual who decides what is, and what is not, to be characterized as Revelation, the transition to the post-Renaissance Age was complete.

This advance was, however, only secured at a price. The development of the new scientific spirit brought with it of necessity a powerful concentration upon the objective, measurable, concrete aspects of experience, and this made for an excessively materialistic attitude to life. So much so that by the end of the nineteenth century even very intelligent people had come to accept the devastating conclusion that the nature of Life could be adequately explained in terms of the movement of minute, solid, particles of matter. The confusions and contradictions which were implicit in this conception soon, however, became apparent, and one of the important consequences was that the primacy of Mind over Matter could again be more confidently affirmed. Now in 1931 we have reached a point when the theories of physics may be said to support the view that it is consciousness which is the basis of form, and not form which is the basis of consciousness.

III

This weakening of the hold of Materialism not only removed a cloud which was darkening the horizon of those who were disposed to find ultimate reality in the spiritual alone; it also coincided with the emergence of a definitely inspirational type of religious philosophy. For to-day the imaginative everywhere are awakening to the possibilities, not only of realizing the spiritual directly within, but, what is no less important, of utilizing spiritual forces to transform the world without. In fine, the characteristic tendency among progressive religionists at the present time is towards working in every sphere from within outwards, rather than from without inwards. In this connexion one need only point to the remarkable growth in recent years of interest in such subjects as spiritual healing, yoga, spiritualism, new thought, Christian Science, Theosophy, and the like.

It is true that from one point of view we are here concerned with what may be described as an extension of the province of physical science. The theosophist, for instance, in so far as he is an occultist, is occupied with research into the hidden laws of nature. But the fact remains that such laws relate to matter as it exists in a more refined form, to activities which lie behind, and thus finally control, those which are studied by ordinary science. So that even in this field we have to do with a transcendence of the materialistic

plane. There is a passage involved from the visible to the invisible, from the world of the senses to another which has reality only for those whose higher faculties have been quickened.

But this withdrawal from externals is most significantly expressed in the mystical, rather than in the occult, side of the new movement. Men and women are to-day looking for light primarily within, placing their trust in the Divine Spark which they feel to be alive in the deepest place in their consciousness. Their faith is in a Power within, a greater Self which is at the same time in some mysterious way their own. Their assumption is that this greater Self can know, act and feel in a manner in which the limited individual self is precluded from knowing, acting and feeling. And they believe that as they identify themselves with it more and more their potencies in all directions will be vastly increased.

All this makes, of course, for a disposition to exalt intuition and inspiration above science—at least above *ordinary* science. For it is assumed that when the individual is thus elevated he draws upon a source of knowledge and power which is not at the command of the normal intelligence; his being is controlled from an altogether higher centre. So we have as a consequence trust in immediate intuition rather than reliance upon the "sound" and accredited principles which have been evolved by solid and uninspired scholarship; healing by the powers of the soul rather than by recourse to material means; an increasing emphasis upon the significance of telepathy, clairvoyance and the influence of the Unseen generally; a growing interest in all those practices and disciplines which make for securing a source of stability and peace inside oneself. The contact which is established with Reality is interior and direct; not primarily through the medium of the senses.

People are to-day more and more concerned to find God within. And the corollary of this fact is that all those religious institutions which base their claims upon either revealed scriptures or traditional authority are steadily losing prestige in their eyes. The twentieth-century individual refuses to entertain the notion that responsibility for the welfare of his soul can be vested in anyone but himself. He will have no *localization* of grace. He rejects decisively the idea that any Church is divinely empowered to accord to, or withhold from, him the privilege of entering into union with the Divine. Nor does he believe that he can ever be saved from corruption except by the influence of his own highest self. And he considers himself free to criticize and evaluate the teachings of all scriptures just as he does any other products of man's creative imagination. By this faith he stands or falls. And indeed he has no other real alternative, for to submit to external authority in this one sphere while repudiating it in every other would be to create a fatal division within the depths of his own spirit.

IV

It remains to observe that this democratization of religion necessarily fosters a spirit of religious universalism. There can be no exclusiveness about the outlook of a man who bases his philosophy on the belief that it is by union with the One Self which is within each of us that the world is to be redeemed. The plane of regional and ethnic religion is completely transcended. Men are drawn together across the frontiers of country and race because they unite in taking as the foundation of their lives faith in science and mysticism, both of which represent the response of the universal in man to the universal in Life. The Hindu, the Moslem or the Christian who responds to the appeal of this New Religion thereby passes beyond the limitations imposed by his traditional beliefs; his attention becomes centred upon man who is the same everywhere because he is the microcosm of the Macrocosm; he becomes concerned more and more with those realizations which are enjoyed by all men in common in so far as they rise from the plane of Nature to that of Spirit. The more profound the mysticism, the more complete the transcendence of nationality and creed. To live in the One is to meet all men, whatever their race, at that central point where they are most representatively human. This is not to say, of course, that distinctions between nations and peoples are to be obscured; the spiritual and the standardized remain firmly opposed. But it is at least to assert that in the mind of the twentieth-century mystic appreciation of those individual manifestations by the variety and complementary character of which the infinite nature of the One is symbolized will be subordinated to a penetrating and sustaining sense of the Unity which underlies all differentiation.

LAWRENCE HYDE

THE ART OF WRITING IN ANCIENT INDIA

[**Professor S. V. Venkateswara,** whose researches have drawn the respect and attention of western savants, has already written for THE ARYAN PATH. In the following article he returns to the old tale of the Orientalists about the origin and knowledge of the art of writing in Ancient India. He employs their own methods to confute them.

Many years ago, under the inspiration of the Theosophical Mahatmas, a very able answer was given to the question:—"Was Writing known before Panini?", in *The Theosophist* for October 1883, to which we would draw our readers' attention.

We also append two extracts from H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* to give the Theosophical view of the subject.—EDS.]

European scholars, following the lead of Max Müller, have held that writing was unknown in India before the times of Pāṇini. They were led to this position by the supposed absence of any mention of "writing, reading, paper or pen in the Vedas," or even in the latest Vedic literature of the Sutra period. It was also held that there was not a single word in Pāṇini's terminology which presupposes the existence of writing. It becomes necessary to re-examine these positions. If the finds in the Indus valley belong to India and are documents connected with Indian culture, the pictographs on the seals of Harappa and Mohenjodaro become inconsistent with a theory of ignorance of the art of writing in Pre-Pāṇinian times. For these documents are admittedly earlier than Pāṇini by a few millennia.

I

Pāṇini mentions the *Grandhikas*, who gave public recitations expounding the stories embodied in their *grandha* or text, and illustrating the same with episodes, oral explanations and pantomimic representations. Among the mythological stories thus preserved in his day were the *Sisukrandīya*, *Yamasabhīya* and *Indrajananīya*. Patanjali adds to this list ancient stories like those of Vasavadattā and Bhaimavatī. But the greatest subject of all was a religious one with symbolic significance, the story of Kamsa being slain by Krishna.

Symbols for writing were known already long before Pāṇini's day. Certain symbols for numerals were marked on the ears of cattle indelibly with a red-hot metal. This was an ancient practice dating from Vedic times, as *ashtakarni* cows are mentioned in the *Ṛg-Veda*. There were also *vishṭakarṇi*, *panchakarṇi*, *bhinnakarṇi*, *maṇikarṇi*, *chhinnakarṇi*, *chhidrakarṇi*, *sruvakarṇi*, and *svastikākarṇi*. His point is that the vowel is short in all these cases, whereas it was lengthened to describe the cattle marked with symbols like the sickle (*dātrākarni*), which had apparently no numerical significance. He derives the terms *lekha* and *lipi*, knows the Greek (*yavanāni*) mode of

writing and uses the terms *lekhaka* and *lipikāra* in the sense of scribes. In the Buddhist *Suttas* and in the Pāli *Jātaka* texts the words used for writing are *lekha* and *lekhaka*, not *lipi* and *lipikāra*. *Lipimudra* is a later term and is found in *Lalitavistara*. Even as late as the *Milinda-praśna*, (the second century B.C.) the term *lekha* appears, along with *mudra* which apparently means *lipimudra*. It is clear that no theory in regard to the Art of Writing before Pāṇini's day could be based on the derivation of *lipi* instead of *lekha*.

Western Scholars like Bühler have based the idea of borrowing on the word *dipi* used in the Asokan texts, and on the circumstance that there are reminiscences of a mode of writing from right to left instead of from left to right. As regards the latter, it is not difficult to understand how the alphabet looks engraved in the reversed fashion when read from the inside of a cave, while it had been inscribed by the engraver from the roof or the top of the cave. Sometimes it is only the first line that is inscribed in this fashion, and the other lines read regularly as they were inscribed from the inside of the cave. It is also possible that ease in carving demanded that lines should be carved alternately from left to right and from right to left, more or less in the fashion of furrows in ploughing or the serpent's winding way. It is not without significance that the term *nāgarī* is connected with *nāga*, the serpent. Thus it would be dangerous to base with Bühler a theory of the foreign origin of the Indian alphabet on the fact that the Eran coin shows letters engraved from right to left and shows each letter reversed.

Bühler considers *lipi* to be a loan-word. The word for *lipi* occurs as *dipi* in the Asoka inscriptions on the North-West frontier, and Hultzsch has pointed out that the derivation of *lipi* from *lip* "to besmear," after the school of Pāṇini, is out of the question. He would derive the word for writing from the Persian, bearing in mind also the expression *nipisita*. But these forms can be easily explained as local variations (ḍ, l, and ṇ,) of the same original sound which was Indo-Iranian. *īḍe* and *īḷe* are variant forms in the Vedic texts, *e.g. agnimīḍe purohitam*. (It appears as *īḍe* in the *Ṛg-Veda* and *īḷe* in the *Yajur Veda*.) So also in modern vernacular: *e. g.*, *giḷi* and *giṇi* for "parrot" in Kannada. The language of the North-West frontier, where the Kharoshthi inscriptions of Asoka are found, would be a Sanskrito-Dravidian *lingua franca*, judging from the Dravidian affiliation of the language of the Brahuis of Beluchistan. Prof. Rhys Davids, a profound student of the Pali texts, was so little impressed with the argument from *dipi* that he preferred a pre-Sumerian to a Sumerian origin for the Indian alphabet. Students of Dravidian languages would be equally little impressed by the arguments from *dipi*. It should also be borne in

mind that Asoka uses the term *lekhāpita, i. e.*"engraved," in his inscriptions.

Aksha, it is well known, means a piece of dice. It comes from the root *aksh*, which means to mark or to cut, and the word in this sense is found actually in use as early as the Vedic texts. Much confusion has been caused in the history of the Maurya period by taking *Akshapaṭala*, who was the Accountant-General in the Maurya times, as described in the *Arthaśāstra*, as connected with gambling. This officer has his counterpart in *Akshāvāpa*, who is one of the ministers of state in the Vedic times. It is ludicrous to connect these officers with gambling. The reference is certainly to the numerals cut on the dice, which were essential for use in calculation. It would be necessary to carry the history of the word *akshara* to Vedic times in order to understand Pāṇini's derivation of the term, as a letter of the alphabet.

II

The term *akshara* is found throughout the range of Vedic literature. It comes from the root *aksh*, which means to cut a mark, and appears clearly in this sense in the *Maitrayani Samhita*. The term *akshara* denotes the imperishable, the carved letter as opposed to the bedaubed or besmeared symbol. Its later derivation from *a-kshara* certainly reminds one of the earlier and the later derivations of *Asura* (*asu-ra* versus *a-sura*). In the Vedic hymns dealing with gambling there are references as early as the *Ṛg-Veda* to the cuts or the marks on the dice and to the cut figures being described as *apsaras*, who were propitiated with ghee. The very term *apsara* is only a variant of *akshara*, but the latter would be the earlier word in the light of the history of the sounds *p* and *k* which are variants in Vedic phonology. The term *varna* (appearing in Tantra texts as *arna*) likewise points to a visible symbol, and is used as a synonym for *akshara* in the *Taittiriya Upanishad*. *Varna* is here contrasted with *svara* (sound). A word of similar significance is *rūpa* which is contrasted with *nāma*.

We can trace the evolution of writing and the use of written documents from the earliest texts of the *Ṛg-Veda* through the later Vedic texts, down to the times of Pāṇini. But it is first necessary to clear one's mind of cant and prejudice. The roots *likh* and *lip* are traceable in the Vedic texts.* The former means to make a scratch or a cut, and the latter to bedaub or besmear. The former process was considered orthodox and has eventually effloresced in the art of sculpture. The latter process would lead to painting, which was regarded as unorthodox. *Ullekhana* and *parilekhana* were processes of making deep cuts in and around the sacrificial altar for protection against enemies and invaders. *Lepa* or *repa*, "something sticking" was invariably used in a bad sense, *e. g.*, *nakarmaṇā lipyate pāpakena* —"one is not tainted by his bad acts (if he be in this condition)". The use of *lepa* in this sinister sense is found as early as the *Taittiriya Brahmana*. It is obvious that the origin of writing in India should be looked for in the direction of *lekha* and not of *lipi*. Even in the Pali *Jātaka* texts the words used are *lekha* and *lekhaka*, and not *lipi* and *lipikāra*.

* Both are Indo-European roots. *Likh* has given rise to our *lecture* through Lat. *legere*, *lectura*, Mid. Eng. and Old Fr. *lethrun*. Our very word *write* originally meant *score* or *cut* (German *reissen*, tear). *Lip* has given birth not only to *Library* but to *libel*! "Graph" and "Scribe" are derived from the root *skarbh* to "engrave," cut or dig out.

Two early Vedic texts clearly refer to written documents preserved in boxes and periodically taken out for purposes of study. Hymns 68 and 72 of the nineteenth Book of the *Atharva Veda* do not permit of any other interpretation. They have been thus translated: "Both of the broad and the narrow, I with power unclose the mouth. With these when we have taken up the *Veda* we pay the holy rites." "Within the chest wherefrom we before took out the Veda, this do we now deposit. Wrought is the sacrifice by the power of Brahma. Through this fervour assist me here, Ye Gods." The *Kauṣika Sutra*, which is the ritualistic commentary on the *Atharva Veda*, says that the former of these hymns was used at the beginning of Vedic studies and the latter at the end of the studies (K. S. 139, 10 and 23). Here we have the earliest reference to the *Grandha* or bundle of leaves, which were used as material inscribed on with a style. It also accords with the view above expressed that the earliest writing was in the way of making cuts or scratches in the materials instead of bedaubing the same with paint of some colour.

III.

We may now consider the bearing of the ancient paleography of Egypt and Sumeria on our subject. The alphabetical marks of ancient Egypt have been discussed by Flinders Petrie. The pottery of pre-dynastic Egypt contains such marks incised by the owners. The marks were cut into the finished pot, and it was seldom that two signs are found together. The First Dynasty signs are also cut in pottery, but more firmly, and sometimes mixed with regular hieroglyphs. Groups of two or three signs were not uncommon now. The alphabetical signs were so foreign to Egypt that they were regarded as aphonic, *i. e.*, as representing no sounds at all. They were evidently borrowed. Prof. Petrie comes to the conclusion that the system of representation by alphabetical signs is older than the system of picture writing.

Gadd describes the combination of pictorial and phonetic writing in Sumeria. Pictorial writing constitutes the skeleton, and phonetic symbols are used to cover it with the flesh of grammatical structure. Many of the Sumerian signs are polyphonous, and the actual reading of a sign depends on the context. Conversely also, entirely different signs share the same phonetic value. In Egypt several hieroglyphs are similarly used to depict the same (initial) sound. The use

of an alphabetical symbol to represent a particular sound and that sound only, was the glory of ancient India.

The Sumerians in historical times used the syllabary system, representing each syllable and not letter by a symbol. But in the oldest Sumer inscription so far studied the name of the king *Za-ga-ga* is given alphabetically. It is clear that the period of syllabary was preceded by one when sounds were represented alphabetically. This alphabetical system was foreign to the genius of Sumeria and was given up, though relics of it survive in Egypt and in Sumeria in historical times. Where then was the alphabet invented?

The Boghar-Koui inscriptions give us the clue. They are documents of Vedic culture and religion. There is reference in them to the Himalayas (*Zimalaya*). The Gods invoked are the Vedic Gods, *Indra*, *Mitra*, *Nāsatya*, etc. All these names are spelt alphabetically, and so also are the common words :–*Pa-ra-a* (*par* in Sumerian), *va-a-tar* (*ba-dur*), *kha-at-ti* (*khat-ti*), *in-da-ra* (*in-dara*). Here also we find the Indian practice, not found in the West, of using alphabetical signs as numerals, which was later on adopted by the Phœnicians and adapted by them to their alphabetical system. The style of writing is *boustrophedon i.e.* the plough-wise one of alternating directions, what has been termed serpentine above. In these inscriptions, therefore, we have the fullest survival in Western Asia of the alphabetical system which is admittedly more ancient than the Egyptian hieroglyphs or the Sumerian syllabary.

The Boghar-Koui inscriptions, the Kassite records and the Tel-el-Amarna letters belong culturally to the period of centuries eighteen to fourteen B. C. They represent a later phase of Vedic religion, as among the Gods invoked we find the most ancient of the Vedic Gods, namely Agni, conspicuous by absence. The reference to the Himalayas shows that this culture was an off-shoot of the Indian Aryan. Already by 2,100 B. C. the Vedic horse had travelled to the West and is found described as the ass of the East in the Babylonian tablet of Hammurabi. Several Vedic hymns indicate the migration of Vedic culture westwards, already in the earliest stratum of the *Ṛg-Veda* (Bks. VI. VII. and VIII.).

IV

In India we have the alphabetical system of writing right through the ages. The Goddess of learning is represented as having an *akshamālā*, *i. e.*, a wreath of letters in her hand. *Rupas*, *i. e.* letters of the alphabet and numerical symbols, are associated with the *maṇikāra* in the Brāhmaṇa texts. *Maṇikāra* has been interpreted as jeweller, and may well denote also the carver on crystal or bead. The Vedic term *lekhana* has survived in *lekhaka*, which means writer or secretary in historical times. *Lipikāra* meant painter not writer, and *lipi* in later times came to mean writing, after writing materials came into use.

The art of writing grew up with the efforts of man to immortalise fleeting forms of expression. The symbols were drawn either from the members of the human body or after external objects or phenomena. The oldest Sumer writing, of the fourth millennium B. C., the oldest writing in predynastic Egypt, and Indian writing through the ages, are alphabetical. The pictographs of Harappa and Mohenjodaro and the square seals of the new finds at pre-Sumerian Kish which contain similar pictographs, must also be interpreted on the same lines. The finds at Kish are admittedly earlier than 4,000 B. C. The alphabetical system of writing in ancient India belongs, therefore, to a period so early and is both ancient and indigenous.

Attempts have been made to trace the origin of the letters of our alphabet on the lines of the Tantra texts. These texts are of a very late date and arose when the art of writing became full-fledged in India, with the complete Indian alphabet of 50 letters. At the same time, the basic principle on which the system is based appears to be ancient, and in the case of some letters there is a continuity of tradition from Vedic times. For instance, the letter *k* represents an earlier stage in phonology than *t* or *p* (cp. *skambha*, *sthambha* ; *anushtuk* and *anustup*). In Vedic texts *k* is definitely mentioned as a form of Prajapati and in the Tantra it denotes Siva or Maheśvara. It is not without significance that Pāṇini bases his groupings of letters expressly on the ancient system of Maheśvara. In religious mysticism *k* is symbolised by the cross, which means the body, and the numbers one and ten—*eka* and *daśa*, associated with Prajāpati. In the Brahmi script *k* has the form of the cross (+). *E* or *ai* is represented by a triangle which was the triple cone of fire, and Agni is described as three-headed in the *Ṛg-Veda*. Some other letters of the alphabet can be derived on similar lines.

S. V. VENKATESWARA

Writing was invented by the Atlanteans, and not at all by the Phœnicians. Indeed, such a claim as that writing was known to mankind many hundreds of millenniums ago, in the face of the philologists who have decreed that writing was unknown in the days of, and to Pâṇini, in India, as also to the Greeks in the time of Homer, will be met by general disapprobation, if not with silent scorn. All denial and ridicule notwithstanding, the Occultists will maintain the claim, and simply for this reason : from Bacon down to our modern Royal Society, we have a too long period, full of the most ludicrous mistakes made by Science, to warrant our believing in modern scientific assumptions rather than in the denials of our Teachers. Writing, our scientists say, was unknown to Pâṇini ; and this sage nevertheless composed a grammar which contains 3,996 rules, and is the most perfect of all the grammars that were ever made! Pâṇini is made out to have lived barely a few

centuries B. C., by the most liberal; and the rocks in Iran and Central Asia (whence the philologists and historians show us the ancestors of the same Pâṇini, the Brahmins, coming into India) are *covered with writing*, two and three thousand years old.—*The Secret Doctrine*, II, 439–440.

In his third Hibbert lecture (1887) Professor Sayce of Oxford, speaking of newly-discovered Assyrian and Babylonian cylinders, referred at length to Ea, the God of Wisdom, now identified with the Oannes of Berosus, the half-man, half-fish, who taught the Babylonians culture *and the art of writing*. This Oannes, to whom, thanks only to the Biblical Deluge, an antiquity of hardly 1,500 B.C. had been hitherto allowed, is now spoken of in these terms:—

"His city was Eridu, which stood 6,000 years ago on the shores of the Persian Gulf. The name means 'the good city,' a particularly holy spot, since it was the centre from which the earliest Chaldean civilization made its way to the north. As the culture-god was represented as coming from the sea, it was possible that the culture of which Eridu was the seat was of foreign importation. *We now know that there was intercourse at a very early period between Chaldea and the Sinaitic peninsula, as well as with India.* The statues discovered by the French at Tel-loh (dating from at latest B. C. 4,000) were made of the extremely hard stone known as diorite, and the inscriptions on them stated the diorite to have been brought from Mazan—*i.e.*, the Sinaitic peninsula, which was then ruled by the Pharaohs. The statues are known to resemble in general style the diorite statue, Kephren, the builder of the second Pyramid, while, according to Mr. Petrie, the unit of measurement marked on the plan of the city, which one of the Tel-loh figures holds on his lap, is the same as that employed by the Pyramid builders. *Teak wood has been found at Mugheir, or Ur of the Chaldees, although that wood is an Indian special product; add to this that an ancient Babylonian list of clothing mentions sindhu, or 'muslins,' explained as 'vegetable cloth'.*"

Muslin, best known now as *Dacca* muslin, known in Chaldea as Hindu (Sindhu), and *teak* wood used 4,000 years B. C.; and yet the Hindus, to whom Chaldea owes its civilization (as well proven by Colonel vans Kennedy), were *ignorant of the art of writing* before the Greeks taught them their alphabet—if we have to believe Orientalists!—*The Secret Doctrine*, II, 225–226.

UNEMPLOYMENT

PAST KARMA AND FUTURE HOPE

[**J. D. Beresford's** name is much in evidence because of the appearance of "The Old People," the first part of a trilogy—*Three Generations*. Recently he said that his books "might have been quite different" if he had been perfectly free; referring, however, to his articles in THE ARYAN PATH he added: "I enjoy turning my mind on theoretical and philosophical problems and writing those articles gives me genuine pleasure." In the following essay Mr. Beresford reviews the subject in his own idealistic way.—EDS.]

The present misery and unemployment throughout Europe and in the United States of America is a lamentable instance of another of the vicious circles that are the inevitable outcome of War. In the years immediately following the Armistice, the credit basis upon which all modern finance rests, encouraged a great inflation of values and permitted the free spending of money that had in various ways been drawn from the National purse. In England, at that time, we were, as a plain matter of fact, living upon the National Debt. At the same time production, so far as it was represented by Export Trade, was already on the decline; and although there was much work to be done at home to make up the deficiencies of the war years, in manufactures, building, road-making and so on, the greater part of it was but another phase of living upon our capital. Thus within ten years of the signing of the Peace, the Nation had come to precisely the same crisis as would overtake the individual in the same conditions. It had been living above its income, and its earning capacity, represented by its export trade, had steadily declined. It lost old customers and could find no new ones, because other nations were in the same difficult position, eager to sell, loth to buy. Economies necessarily followed, and with these economies we come into a clear view of the vicious circle. Every cut in the cost of production, every bankruptcy, even the fall in the cost of living, represented a reduction in the employment of Labour; and the figures in England mounted steadily from something under one million to nearly three, while in such countries as Germany and the United States they are much higher still. This increase of unemployment put the further burden of out-of-work pay upon the State, (England pays a higher rate than any other country in the world), and aggravated the dangers of non-production. Instead of living upon our capital we had to live upon our income, only to find it steadily decreasing year by year. To break this vicious circle some bold remedy was necessary, and the obvious one was to reduce the value of the pound sterling by abandoning the Gold Standard. And if the pound sterling can

be maintained at its present value (at the moment of writing, about four dollars or a hundred French francs) the saving in costs of production as judged by foreign currencies may enable Great Britain to break the circle, and will in any case momentarily relieve trade depression.

This in the fewest possible words is a résumé of the economic position that has led to the present low-water mark of employment in Great Britain. In a sense, this crisis was unavoidable, since it was induced by conditions acting upon a people who had not the inclination even if they had had the capacity to think of the future. Many of our economists foresaw what was coming and stated their beliefs in the clearest possible words, but public opinion is not to be influenced in this matter by the statements of the few, any more than it is in the matter of things spiritual. For, whether the unit be the nation or the average individual, we shall find the same desire to enjoy the moment and to hope that the evil day to come may somehow be averted, because we have no true sense of responsibility either to ourselves or to one another. If we had had such a sense, there can be no shadow of doubt that the present conditions could have been avoided; for there is a power in mankind, at present feeble and undeveloped, that can override economic and even what we term physical laws. But the development of that power as a remedy for all ills, is a process that is governed in its turn by a higher law whose workings are at present beyond our full understanding; only we know that the law of Karma whether as applied to individuals or to nations must be fulfilled.

Coming, now, from causes to effects, it may be worth while to turn to the influence of the past two years or so upon those three millions of ours that are now out of work. And in the first place we have to face the unpleasant conclusion that they represent what I must call the sediment of humanity. They are not, of course, all destined to settle at the bottom of the mixture for the same reasons. Some are really incompetent; others are idle, slow, lacking in initiative, untrustworthy, weak of purpose, alcoholics, confined by set habits of thought and living, immobile, or with that tendency to a fierce egotism which so often finds an expression in what we call crime. But this re-agent of economic crisis infallibly separates in the first instance those who are least fitted to struggle against the conditions. It is indeed a matter of common experience that a certain type of man and woman is never unemployed in any class of society; the most characteristic distinction that separates this type from the sediment being greater mental and physical energy.

The most casual observation of those who wait day by day outside our Labour Exchanges will confirm this statement; and, be it remembered, those who do thus make their daily enquiry represent the more active of the unemployed; there is a still more stagnant level even than this. But we see those who do, at least, take the trouble to join the daily queue, lounging, smoking, gossiping; influencing us to the unavoidable inference that they prefer living on the dole to engaging themselves to regular work at a slightly higher rate of pay. The majority of them, in fact, exhibit in a more legible character that same indolence of mind, and lack of the sense of responsibility that, as I have indicated, determined in the first place the present condition.

Moreover it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that lack of employment among those on this level of consciousness, tends to increase the disinclination for work. *The little flame of the spirit needs to be tended if it is to burn more brightly.* And since all the functions of activity derive their forces ultimately from this spirit, which is consciousness, life, the failure of even such a stimulus as hard necessity to overcome all the inertias of the gross corporeal envelope we call the flesh, tends to weaken the flame and lower the bodily and mental energy. Wherefore *the longer the present conditions continue, the greater will become the number not only of the unemployed but of the unemployable.*

Analysis, or dissection, is a worthless process unless it is used as a means of gaining knowledge that will enable us to build up, reconstruct,—a point of view that I elaborated in a critical article for THE ARYAN PATH, some eighteen months ago. And what we have to ask ourselves is whether, having put our finger on the weakness, we can do anything to combat it.

What that weakness is I have already suggested, but it may be as well to emphasise it by a restatement. It derives, then, in my opinion, from what I may call the isolation of the individuality. In those years of spending that immediately followed the armistice, there was a craze for ostentation and luxury in every class. In other words there was an exhibition of selfishness, which characteristic as it is of humanity at all times, was then more painfully evident than usual. For this is but another example of the failure to tend that feeble flame of the spirit, and as in the former case, the ability to tend it diminishes by neglect. And as we know by all the examples of history *it is prosperity rather than adversity that destroys the soul of a nation.*

The effect in all cases is much the same. Luxury and idleness weaken the higher aspirations and compel us to live self-centred within ourselves. (There may be possible exceptions to this rule, the majority of them more apparent than real, but broadly speaking the rule is general enough to be accepted as universal.) As a consequence that ideal of the self which we form throughout life—a false ideal since it is built up mainly by exclusions rather than by a desire to broaden our outlook—becomes still more restricted. Generosity is weakened, jeal-

ousy increased, noticeably between the various classes, and, most typical of all, we lose one of the main inspirations to personal and national responsibility by our unwillingness to look beyond the day.

Now, if that period of inflation and spurious prosperity had been longer drawn out, if, *a fortiori*, it had been not a seeming but a real wealth, we should in all probability have drifted into a class-war. (We may do that still but if we do, it will be for a different reason, and find inception not in the revolt of labour but of the unemployed.) As it is, I find a cause for hope in our present adversity, and the prospect of future suffering.

For the only remedy for our condition is through such an experience of forced unselfishness as may compel us to break through that shell, I called the false ideal of self, and substitute a true ideal in its place. All else, economic reconstructions, a revival of trade, the return of plentiful and well-paid employment, is but another turn of the wheel that will lead to a high point of commercial prosperity and, inevitably, pass on to another descent. That it may come in the course of a few years is not improbable. Very much the same thing happened in the nineteenth century, culminating in what we know as the hungry 'forties and the great revolution year of 1848. But history, in fact, does not exactly repeat itself, and the people of to-day, however adversely affected by the experiences of the past thirteen evil years, have a higher ethical standard and a wider outlook than those of a hundred years ago.

What I look for, then, as an outcome of the imminent distress that will affect all classes in England, each according to its degree, throughout the next few years, is a revival of the religious spirit, by which I do not mean a reinvigoration of the orthodox churches—though that, too, will play its part,—but a truer realisation of the Self in its relation to humanity as a whole. I wrote at the beginning of this article of the need for the sense of responsibility both to ourselves and to others, and it will be by a quickening of this sense that the sum of true happiness in the world may be increased. It is not, however, an end in itself, but only a means by which we may come to a measure of self-realisation.

The negation of selfishness as we commonly understand that word, the understanding of the true relation of the ego to that which we falsely believe to be the personality—fostering that belief as a rule by every means in our power—is an end that may be attained only by those who have suffered a long toll of experience. But the road to self-knowledge and to the quickening of the world-spirit is by way of the understanding that to live for our own enjoyment is a form of spiritual suicide.

J. D. BERESFORD

THE LEISURE OF THE FUTURE

[**Prof. C. E. M. Joad's** practical application of philosophic principles has been greatly appreciated by thinking people. Our readers have enjoyed his theories and ideas and we are glad to publish below an essay in which philosophical universals are made applicable to the details of daily life-problems.—EDS.]

I

In a recent number of THE ARYAN PATH I wrote an article on "The Civilised Use of Work and Leisure," in which I suggested that the appropriate use of leisure consisted in the exercise of our highest faculties at full stretch. The suggestion was, admittedly, vague, and in the present article I shall try to amplify it and at the same time to give it great precision.

In order that I may do this, it is necessary that I should assume the truth of three philosophical positions. I have endeavoured to set forth the reasons for these positions elsewhere.* As I cannot defend them here, I must content myself with briefly stating them.

(1) I hold in the first place that life is an independent principle or force, which manifests or expresses itself in a material medium. The result of life's manifestation or expression in matter is an individual living organism. The distinction between life and matter is on this view ultimate, and living organisms including human beings are to be regarded as units of matter temporarily animated by a stream or force of life.

(2) The activity of life is mainly cognitive; it is, that is to say, an activity of knowing. Knowing is a process in which mind becomes aware of something other than itself; it is, that is to say, never the same as the object known. This distinction between knower and known obtains at all levels of knowing. It is as true, in other words, to say that when I know God or Beauty I remain distinct from and am in no sense merged in what I know, as to say that, when I know a table, I remain distinct from and in no sense become the table.

(3) Knowing is in no sense limited to the knowing of material things. On the contrary most of the objects which we know do not belong to the material world. Consider, for example, an historical object such as Cæsar. Of what am I thinking when I am thinking of Cæsar? A thought about Cæsar is clearly not a thought about a piece of matter, since Cæsar as a piece of matter no longer exists, or, if he does, he is by now so diffused through the substance of the planet and our own bodies, that he is no longer isolable as a piece of matter. Yet thinking about Cæsar is certainly a thinking about something; this is clear, if only because a thought of Cæsar is different from a thought of Alexander; therefore, Cæsar must in some sense exist, both in order that he may be

*See my *Matter, Life and Value* published by the Oxford University Press.

thought about and also that he may possess the property of being different from Alexander. Nor is it the case that to think about Cæsar is to be aware of a notion or idea in one's own mind, a concept, as it is sometimes called. If this were so, we should each of us be thinking about something different when we thought about Cæsar, namely, about a different idea in each thinker's mind, and intelligible discussion about history would be impossible. Indeed communication of any kind between people would be impossible, since no two people would or could think of the same thing. Secondly, if Cæsar were only an idea in the mind of the thinker, the abolition of all people thinking about Cæsar would mean the abolition of Cæsar; or, to put the point generally, the total elimination of mind from the universe would involve the going out of existence of history, not, that is to say, of the *knowledge* of history, but of all those events and personages which make up the content of the history we know. But a present event such as the abolition of thinking persons cannot affect a past event such as the battle of Waterloo, nor does there seem any reason to suppose that the fact that the battle of Waterloo was fought in 1815 ceases to be a fact merely because nobody is thinking about it. Objects such as Cæsar and the battle of Waterloo seem therefore,

(*a*) not to be material things;
(*b*) not to be mental ideas or concepts. Nevertheless they indubitably exist and are something since we cannot think about nothing and we can certainly think about them. I propose, therefore, to call them non-committally objects of thought.

Proceeding on these lines, I should interpret the activity of thinking, as opposed to the enjoyment of sensory experience, as the mind's awareness of non-material objects of thought. It is objects of thought that we know in history, geography, science, mathematics and philosophy. I should further hold that behind and beyond objects of thought, there are objects of value. Of these we can discern three, goodness, truth and beauty, and I agree with Plato in holding that these too are changeless, eternal objects known by mind, but in no sense its products. Manifested in the world of changing matter they are the source of the beauty of works of art, the ethical qualities we admire in character and conduct, the truths of science and philosophy. Behind these again, possibly their source, possibly their unity, possibly their sum, many have believed themselves to have experienced intimations of a further and more fundamental object, which they have named Deity.

II

I can now proceed to state the view which I wish to put forward. Life, it is obvious, develops and evolves. This development may, I hold, be described in terms of an increase in the power, scope and subtlety of the faculty of knowledge

on the part of living organisms. Life at a more highly evolved level is life knowing more of the contents of the universe than life at an earlier level and knowing new types of contents. Already life has evolved in us to a point at which the knowledge of objects of thought is habitual; there is even a fleeting and intermittent awareness of objects of value. Life's evolution in the future will, I hold, consist in a further extension of the range of subtlety of knowledge, so that our remote descendants will enjoy a continuous and untrammelled apprehension of the value which we now know only uncertainly and intermittently.

I will now seek to apply this general view to the particular problem of the use of leisure by human beings at the stage of evolution which in us life has reached. Life, I am assuming, appears initially in a world of matter, and infuses itself into the material of this world, in order to create living organisms. Now life as expressed in these organisms is characterized by a two-fold relationship to matter. It knows or is aware of it, and it is dependent upon it. By life's knowledge of matter I mean merely that the interest and attention of earlier forms of living organisms are directed exclusively upon material objects. The attention of plants is largely concentrated upon themselves; they are aware of their own bodily needs—of the need for sustenance, for example—and of the need to reproduce themselves. Needs of this kind—the *feelings* as we may call them, of the plant—can be analysed in terms of the plant's awareness of chemical changes in its own material structure. Animals, aware of their own needs, are aware also of material objects external to themselves; for example, they know other animals. But although the scope of their awareness has widened, their attention is still directed almost exclusively upon material objects. It is probable that some animals are capable of the rudiments of thought, but if they think, they do so rarely and intermittently, their actions being, with the exception of a few doubtful cases, adequately accounted for in terms of reaction to material stimuli. When we come to human beings there is a change. Savages, indeed, think little more than animals, and their lives are spent largely in knowing and attending to matter: but in civilized man thinking has become normal. Life, that is to say, has in him emerged for the first time at a level at which its attention is more or less continuously directed not upon the world of matter, but upon non-material objects of thought.

In order that we may realise how this advance has become possible, let us consider the other aspect of life's relationship to matter—namely, its dependence upon it. Life as manifested in the early forms of living organisms is almost completely at the mercy of its material setting. The mind is enslaved by the body, and by the ills that beset

the body, while the organism as a whole is a plaything for the brute forces of nature. It is the sense of our helplessness before matter that has been the motive force of much religion, the power of a semi-human God being invented to compensate for the powerlessness of man.

It is the primary achievement of civilization that it has lessened this domination of matter over man. In the first place we attain to an increasing mastery over the matter which constitutes our own bodies. We have changed, and continue to change, the structure of our bodies by the uses to which we put them. These changes have been wrought unconsciously; but we also possess power over the body which we exercise consciously. With each generation that passes, we can prevent the body from decaying for longer periods, and, when at last decay sets in, we can hold life in the body and so prevent dissolution for longer periods.

Parallel with our growth of power over our bodies is our increasing mastery of the forces of nature. Instead of fearing or worshipping them, we have harnessed them to our uses. By the construction of appropriate machines we have made not only gravitation our slave, but also electricity and magnetism, atomic attraction, repulsion, polarization, and so forth. We can utilise these forces to transcend our limitations by making for ourselves new limbs to supplement our original bodily inheritance, cranes and elevators to do the work of arms, and trains and motors to take the place of legs. We have learned to fly and supply ourselves with wings in the shape of aeroplanes.

Now, every fresh advance in power over matter diminishes our need to know it. For example, we do less with our hands than our ancestors; we do not carry weights about, defend ourselves from attack, or develop great muscular strength. Compared with primitive man, we make but little use of material, physical, objects. So true is this that the ordinary clerk or professional man can, broadly speaking, go through the day without using his hands at all, except to dress and feed himself and to write. Our senses decay as the need for awareness of physical objects grow less; the savage can hear noises to which we are deaf, and our sense of smell grows duller with each generation. Every advance in applied science is, indeed, rightly considered, merely a contrivance for diminishing our need to have intercourse with matter. The proper function of machines is to intervene between us and matter, and so to release us from our dependence upon the material world. Machines, in fact, are the extra limbs which we have made outside ourselves to do our business with matter for us. Machines no doubt are themselves material, but our intercourse with machines can be reduced in theory to the necessity for pressing an occasional button; and as we succeed in delegating more and more of

our dealings with matter to them, the obligation to direct our attention upon matter will disappear. The energy and attention thus released will come to be directed increasingly first upon objects of thought and later upon objects of value. Thus the evolution of life consists in a progression from a knowledge of the world of matter through a knowledge of the world of thought to a knowledge of the world of value.

III

We are now in a position to come directly to the problem of leisure-using. Effort and endeavour have been, as I suggested in my previous article, the law of life's development in the past. Biologists speak of this law as the struggle for existence. The struggle for existence on the physical plane has been largly transcended; we no longer fight one another with tooth and claw for the available food supply, and although the crudely physical competition with our fellows has been superseded by a struggle in the economic field over wages and prices, this is carefully restricted to business hours. When they are over, we think that we are entitled to relax and to take our ease; our leisure, we feel, should be free from struggle. This belief is delusion. In all ages men who have had the opportunity to try every kind of life, combined with the energy and the talents to give the more exacting lives a fair trial, have seemed to reach agreement on this one point, that the only things which can give permanent satisfaction are the employment of our best faculties at their highest pitch, alternating with the recreation of the mind in music and art and literature and the conversation of our friends.

Now, what I wish to suggest is that life has now reached a stage at which the appropriate field for effort and endeavour lies not in the world of matter but in the world of thought. Not only is it the case that effort in the world of thought is as real and as exciting as effort in the world of matter, but life has now reached a stage at which such effort alone is permanently satisfying, so that, just as the urge of life once drove men to acquire new qualities of physical skill and to lay up fresh reserves of physical endurance in the struggle against nature, so it now finds its most appropriate expression in the effort to paint a picture or to remodel a social system, to realize life imaginatively in fiction or to grapple with the problems of existence. Thinking, which is the knowledge of objects of thought, is now the appropriate activity of normal, educated men, just as the apprehension of objects of value in artistic creation and mystical contemplation is the privilege of the race's most advanced representatives.

To the suggestion of my last article that the full exercise of our faculties in effort and endeavour and not relaxation and ease are the appropriate activities to leisure, I now add, therefore, that they must be exercised on the intellec-

tual and spiritual planes, that is in the knowledge of the worlds of thought and value. For, granted that the activity appropriate to the level of development which our species has reached is the knowledge of objects of thought and the endeavour to know increasingly objects of value, it will follow that effort and endeavour on the physical plane will no longer be found completely satisfying. It is, nevertheless, on the physical plane that most of us still seek occupation for our leisure.

To whack small round bits of matter about with long thin ones in the shape of bats, clubs, racquets, cues and mallets, or to introduce pieces of metal into the bodies of birds and beasts from a distance still constitute, under the title of games and sport, the chief leisure occupations of the Western world. These occupations are, as I have already pointed out, found to be increasingly unsatisfying. The suicide rate among the unemployed rich is higher than in any other class of a Western community, and those whose economic position enables their sole anxiety to be the discovery of occupations for leisure are engaged in a continual struggle with their enemy boredom.

My suggestion is that boredom is a menace, because we habitually seek our occupations at a lower level of activity than that for which life has now fitted us; that we fail, that is to say, to live up to the challenge of our most recently evolved faculties. We are like children, who will insist on playing with toys that they have outgrown. It is time that we discarded our toys, and remembering that it is only children who identify reality with what they can see and touch, occupy ourselves with the exploration of the non-material world of thought and the cultivation of the world of value. The pursuits of Shaw's Ancients in the last play of the "Back to Methuselah" Pentateuch afford a good example of what will, in my view, be the occupations of the leisure of the future, and a hint to the wise in the present.

C. E. M. JOAD

SEEK FOR THE LARGER VIEW

(*An Interview with Lord Haldane*)

[**R. L. Mégroz** whose literary and biographical work is gaining recognition among men of letters reports the following instructive conversation with a man whose mind was profound and whose heart was discerning.—EDS.]

One day in 1925, I went to see Lord Haldane at his house in Queen Anne's Gate, which being next door to Whitehall and Buckingham Palace, was his residence when work in London kept him away from the village of Cloan, his Perthshire home. As I entered, my dominant impression was of quietness and light—an impression which was confirmed when I came into his small, neat, bright study and was gently motioned to a leather armchair. Perhaps I expected to find some kind of Carlylean disorder and wildness in the philosopher's house. For a moment I lost my cue and did not speak. "Well ?" said Viscount Haldane, smiling across his little desk at me.

"I wanted to ask you, er, a curious question," I stammered, for suddenly the question I had in mind seemed outlandish in that business-like room.

"Because you have somehow linked modern science and philosophy together, Lord Haldane, I want to ask you if the spectacle of the stars in the sky ought to be comforting to us, or depressing. Ought not the contemplation of the stars to encourage the individual to face personal misfortunes ?"

"The stars are dead things," Viscount Haldane answered without hesitation, and with no attempt to laugh at me. "They are mere externality. *External things cannot help.*"

"How then should the individual use his mind to live on the highest level ? What does the rest of the universe mean to each of us ?"

"The first and most important thing is to realise what experience means. We start from our experience. We must not overlook any of its phases, nor, on the other hand, must we misconstrue or add to them. We live in a world in which we do more than live. We are always more, however humble we are, than we take ourselves to be. The experience which seems to confront us cannot be separated as though it were some distinct entity from the mind which appears merely to contemplate or be aware of it.

"The experience of a dog is much more limited than that of a man," he continued, developing his exposition without a pause in the clear flow of his sentences. "The dog knows nothing of beauty, or of the State, or of strikes, or of aeroplanes. He has a universe, but it is a very local and limited one. The beetle has a world still more limited; and yet each, the dog and the beetle, show their intelligence in construing their experience. The dog has his kennel, and distinguishes his master and may show affection for him.

"But in the case of man there

is a universe much more wide. We are aware of what comes to us through seeing, feeling, hearing, smelling, touching, and tasting, and yet that awareness goes far beyond the mere sensations of the senses. We construe these, and as construed they make up our experience. But it is an experience with many levels or orders in it. Orders stand not only for degrees in reality, but for degrees in our knowledge of that reality. We begin to find that what we take to be an experience independent of ourselves, a world of objects, is not really independent of the mind that perceives it. We begin to see also that we have been led into a mistake about these by assuming that our minds are more or less particular kinds of objects, of which we have experience and of which what we call *knowledge* is treated as being a property, an activity which the mind may display or may not display. And yet we know nothing of the mind apart from its knowledge. Within that knowledge every object of experience, actual or possible, falls. It is some kind of knowledge about it that gives meaning to the object, and apart from meaning, the object has not any significance. Even an atom, apart from the meaning, the interpretation we attach to it, has no significance for us. It could not be recognised and it would not in any sense *be*. It is only as possessing significance, actual or possible, for knowledge, that there is any reality. But if this be so within the mind, can it (the mind) be a thing standing in some external relation separable from itself, which we call knowledge? The mind and the objects of the mind alike fall within knowledge. Knowledge must be taken in the widest sense, as including feeling as well as abstract thought. And feeling and abstract thought are not separable. All feeling, in order to be recognised, involves reflection in some form, and reflection is nothing more apart from feeling, which enters into it and on which it is based, than a mere abstraction. We express our reflections in images, in which we think. We think, in other words, in metaphors. Even in mathematics, one of the most abstract of sciences, x and y are marks on the paper with which we perform operations, and which we either represent upon the paper or image to ourselves. Yet the identity in the abstract knowledge we thus get is not an identity of things in space and time; it is a set of identical thoughts. And the set of thoughts of Euclid about his 47th proposition are literally the same thoughts, as ours in learning the proposition; although his papyrus was quite different from the paper on which I, for instance, present the same set of mathematical operations of my thinking as he did.

"The mind is therefore just knowledge, which in an abstract kind of way divorces itself from every particular elementary experience, and has its essence in its general principles. It is only by an abstraction that it makes itself,

what experience under a partial aspect takes it to be—an object in that world. Therefore when we look at the world of experience, we find in it mind as well as another abstraction—matter. We classify and turn into abstract propositions the various phases which experience presents; but as our thoughts do not wholly construe experience and there is always the element of the particular which has to be construed into knowledge in order to give us meaning and reality, thought does not make things. It is only an essential phase which experience has to present if it is to have meaning and reality. We cannot divorce thought from things or things from thought. In the world of experience there are many kinds, all of which depend upon the conceptions which we apply as appropriate to them in giving the meaning. There is order in externality, such as the order we can see in numbers and atoms external to one another. There is the order of life, in which we are not concerned with causes and effects external to one another in time and space, but with ends realising themselves immediately and giving rise to the behaviour of living organisms. There are higher orders, such as those of freedom, of personality, of the State, of beauty, of religion."

"But you began by saying that there was no help for the individual in considering the stars," I interjected. "If there is in the infinite heavens an external order which in sequences and harmony resembles the order of human life, should not man find a religious inspiration in contemplating it? Or are all the poets wrong?"

"We may find inspiration in the beauty and grandeur of the spectacle of the heavens," Haldane replied, "but the predominating externality of the heavenly bodies and the endlessness of their number exemplify not a higher, but a lower order of conception than that of the mind. We do not find the entirety is the whole. It is only a whole for the mind that constructively embraces it."

He then resumed the train of his thought, speaking as unhesitatingly now as before:

"Now human experience, with its many phases, is nevertheless not final or complete. The power of reflection knows no barrier. It is always capable of an unlimited range—although in terms that are abstract or general, and therefore do not give us that fact of the particular which we require if we are to have a concrete individual object before us as reality. But thought, nevertheless, is always pointing to an ideal which is above ourselves and above our individual minds, conditioned, as they are, by the necessity for their existence as objects in time and space possessing an organisation and a place and station within nature. Evolution accounts for that organisation, and explains its range and its limitations, but the world which evolution pre-supposes as the world in which it is to take place, first pre-supposes the mind to which it owes existence. We thus come back to mind as the foundation of the universe.

Subject and object are only artificially separated. They seem to be only aspects of a larger whole which we cannot exhaust. Our sense of the divine is the indication that there is more in our universe than mere mechanism or mere life or mere finite personality. We are pointed to something beyond, which we cannot envisage, because it is only an ideal in our experience and no object of which we can have direct experience. That is how we come to the conception of God, and that is how our metaphors about God and the divine are always insufficient, although they are not less the vehicles by means of which we approach our final ideal."

While the level voice had travelled smoothly over these extensive tracts of thought the listener had formed another question. Haldane spoke of reflection as being without barriers, and yet as an abstraction apart from feeling. This, although he did not so word it, implied that reflection was necessarily personal and could not achieve that purely objective quality which is generally (and perhaps falsely) implied by the term scientific. If reflection must embody and express feeling, is it not limited by the individual's emotional temperament? Reflection may lead one man to a belief in God and another to a denial of any beneficent or intelligent Personality in the universe. And how can mere ratiocination reach any reliable judgment on points of view which are ultimately personal? I tried to put the difficulty to Lord Haldane, and without offering any criticism of it, I will simply report his reply:—

"Feeling has no reality apart from reflection, which gives it reality. All the terms I have been using are, of course, symbols in general knowledge. Feeling may not be such as enables us to form an image of what lies beyond, and therefore the reflection is what I have called abstract; that is to say, is given only in general conceptions, for the expression of which our images are mere metaphors or symbols. With regard to the difference between one man's experience and another's, the sense of the divine is a sense which overcomes the barrier between subject and object and the happenings to the individual. A man must learn to get a point of view which includes the universe and himself in it. If he does that he will believe in the ultimate reality of the universe—believe its foundation in mind—believe in God. This is, of course, a doctrine of immanence. Browning has said the same thing, you remember:

There are flashes struck from midnights,
  There are fire-flames noondays kindle,
Whereby piled-up honours perish,
  Whereby swollen ambitions dwindle,
While just this or that poor impulse,
  Which for once had play unstifled,
Seems the sole work of a lifetime
  That away the rest have trifled.

I could not, obviously, push the Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Dominions beyond the Sea into fresh ramifications of this endless theme, so I contented myself with a last and simple test question. I asked him to tell me what, to him, was the lesson that life has to teach.

"To try always to rise to a wider outlook," came the characteristic response at once. "The secret of real success in life is in the individual's point of view. Goethe taught that to seek for the larger view should be our chief aim. External success matters very little, after all; and neither does external failure."

In re-reading my verbatim notes of this wise man's talk I am once more impressed—and many readers must be similarly impressed—by something more than the breadth of Haldane's search for truth; by a spirit which seems to bring him very close to many teachings which we rather vaguely describe as "the wisdom of the East". But when one reads that noble last chapter of his Autobiography, this haunting sense of something that was still developing in his outlook is found to be justifiably linked with the Orient. There he confesses that in his later years he had studied India's philosophical literature, for it had "often struck me that we of the Western world have contracted our outlook by failure to take in the full significance of the development of reflection on ultimate things in India . . . There is in Bengal particularly a philosophical outlook which has moulded even Indian political aspirations among Mohammedans as well as Hindus."

And then, reverting naturally to the practical side of this question, he goes on to point out the connection between Indian thought and the best means of carrying out reforms in the system of Indian government. And he reminds his western readers that "want of knowledge has brought in its train want of sympathy".

R. L. MÉGROZ

The seeds of Wisdom cannot sprout and grow in airless space. To live and reap experience, the mind needs breadth and depth and points to draw it towards the Diamond Soul. Seek not those points in Maya's realm; but soar beyond illusions, search the eternal and the changeless SAT, *mistrusting fancy's false suggestions.*

For mind is like a mirror; it gathers dust while it reflects. It needs the gentle breezes of Soul-Wisdom to brush away the dust of our illusions. Seek, O Beginner, to blend thy Mind and Soul.

THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE.

THE TWO H. P. BLAVATSKYS

[**R. A. V. Morris** is a student of Theosophy who is not connected with any Theosophical organization. For long years he has *studied* Theosophical philosophy and Theosophical history and is admired for his strong commonsense, judicious impartiality and sweet reasonableness.

In his article our author makes important points on the subject of phenomena and spiritualism which should be considered in reading the review-article of Mr. Middleton Murry which follows.—EDS.]

No one who is familiar with the history of the modern Theosophical movement can fail to have wondered at the glaring contrast between the picture of H. P. Blavatsky as revealed by her own writings and the narratives of her friends and colleagues, and the H. P. Blavatsky depicted by her enemies and slanderers. The two characters are utterly inconsistent and it is one of the minor puzzles of history how both can have been attributed to the same individual.

In choosing which of them we shall accept as the true one, we must always bear in mind that what is inconsistent with a proven truth cannot itself be true; and the stories—for the most part repeated on the merest hearsay—detrimental to H. P. Blavatsky's reputation, which have recently been revived by a sensational journalist, are entirely inconsistent with the great mass of well attested and substantiated facts.

The charges brought against H. P. Blavatsky relate to all sides of her character and every period of her life. According to the Solovyoff-Witte-Coulomb legend, her whole career, from the day that she left her husband, as a girl of seventeen, was a long series of scandalous adventures. To put the case in a nutshell, she was a thoroughly immoral, dishonest and unscrupulous person; and her Theosophy an invention,concocted to bring her money or influence. Her phenomena, if we can rely on Dr. Richard Hodgson's judgment, were all fraudulent; her Masters myths, and their letters forgeries. The Hodgson charges, being more definite and relating to matters less inaccessible in time and place, are more easily met than the legends, derived from Russian sources, which purport to describe her life in the years prior to her arrival in America in 1873; and have been effectively analysed and replied to on various occasions. One of the latest and ablest of these replies, is Mr. William Kingsland's "Was She a Charlatan?—" in which he proves to demonstration that Dr. Hodgson's claim to have investigated the Blavatsky phenomena was groundless, for he neither saw any of the phenomena for himself nor did he invite the evidence of H. P. Blavatsky herself or her friends. All he did was to collect statements from her avowed enemies and to build conclusions

on them. At best his famous Report is an *ex parte* judgment delivered not from the bench, but by the attorney for the prosecution.

But the older and more extensive class of slanderous stories has never been subjected to systematic and detailed criticism from the point of view of the defence. This might have been done in the year 1891 had not the death of H. P. Blavatsky brought automatically to a close the libel action she had launched against the *New York Sun*. This newspaper had in July 1890 published a long attack on H. P. Blavatsky, in which a whole long series of charges and slanderous stories were detailed—seven closely printed columns of them, covering the period from 1857 onwards. Proceedings for libel were immediately instituted and were pending in May 1891 when Madame Blavatsky died. In an interim report of the progress of the action, dated March 1891, we are told that:—

> The *Sun* put in a long answer to Mme. Blavatsky's complaint and her lawyers demurred to its sufficiency as a defence. That question of law was argued...in the Supreme Court, and on the argument the lawyers for the *Sun* confessed in open court their inability to prove the charge of immorality on which the suit lies, and asked to be allowed to retain the mass of irrelevant matter in the answer.....Judge Beach sustained Mme. Blavatsky's objection and ordered that the objectionable matter be stricken out.

Although under no legal obligation to do so, the *Sun*, by that time fully convinced of the injustice of its attack on H.P.Blavatsky, in September, 1892, withdrew the charges in an editorial, and printed a long article by Mr. W. Q. Judge eulogising her life work and character.

In addition to the slanders included in the *New York Sun's* indictment and retractation, there were others of the same general type, which were printed for the first time in *A Priestess of Isis* by V. Solovyoff in 1894. This book, the tone and method of which are open to grave critical objection, contains, *inter alia*, a letter alleged to have been written by H.P. Blavatsky as a "confession" of her guilt in regard to certain charges, but which, even in Solovyoff's untrustworthy translation, is obviously not a confession but a denial in rather hyperbolical language.

Inasmuch as all the slanders we have been discussing relate to a period earlier than 1873, and as some of them are concerned with things that are supposed to have happened in such places as Russia, Turkey and Egypt, the difficulty of *proving* them to be untrue will be apparent. It should not be necessary to do so, for in every system of equity the burden of proof is upon the accuser, and the accused person is held to be innocent until proved guilty; but, when a prominent individual, especially if he be the champion of an unpopular cause, is slandered, this fundamental rule of justice is apt to be disregarded, and we have the proverbial saying that if enough mud is thrown, some of it will stick.

While disproof of *all* the libels on H. P. Blavatsky is in the circumstances difficult if not impossible, at any rate it is safe to say that none of them can be proved, and those that cannot be demonstrated to be false, can be shown to be extremely improbable. But, despite this, there are people who will still think that so much smoke shows there must have been some fire; that there must have been some foundation of fact for so imposing an edifice of fancy. Perhaps the best way in which this attitude may be met is to account for the slanders by showing how and why they became current. In order to do this, it will be necessary to refer briefly to H. P. Blavatsky's social environment in Russia, where most though not all of the slanders were launched, and to certain phases of thought in America, India and elsewhere, where every gibe, every libel, every attack on H. P. Blavatsky was eagerly accepted and circulated.

To begin with, it must be remembered that Madame Blavatsky was utterly unconventional and indifferent to what people thought of her. Her very freedom from some of the ordinary attributes of humanity—sex love, for instance—her contempt for shams and the merely outward respectabilities, led her at times into saying and doing things which she would have sedulously avoided had she really been the cunning and selfish schemer we are asked to believe her. While H. P. Blavatsky was thus, the environment into which she was born was in violent contrast. Her mother was a member of the most exclusive and conservative circle of the old Russian aristocracy, and her father a military officer of a noble German family long settled in Russia. In that now vanished Russian *ancien noblesse*, we can picture on the one hand elements of the narrowest primness and propriety, and on the other much dissoluteness and decadence. What could such a society, in the mid-nineteenth century, make of a portent like H. P. Blavatsky? In England at that period a woman who rode on the top of an omnibus was considered "fast"; and forty years later, in the eighteen-nineties, a woman bold enough to wear knee breeches for cycling was jeered at and abused, while if she used lip salve or face powder, she was dubbed forthright a "painted Jezebel". What then must a still narrower and more primitive society have thought of one who left home and husband to go a-voyaging, unchaperoned, into outlandish places, who smoked cigarettes, and generally assumed all the liberty of action which then was held to be the sole prerogative of the male sex? Can we not imagine the spiteful cackle that must have gone the rounds of the drawing-rooms and mess-tables of Petersburg and Odessa? Would not such a challenger of conventions have been believed to be capable of anything? "Have you heard the latest about that Blavatsky woman? So-and-so saw her in Constantinople riding in a circus, or in Cairo living with a man, or in Athens running a drinking bar, or in Timbuctoo, or where you will?"

That none of this cycle of legends were believed by her nearest relatives, by her father, uncle, aunt and sister, who remained to the end in close and affectionate touch with H. P. Blavatsky, should be sufficient indication of their origin in mere gossip. Some distant connections, like Witte, on the other hand, who were never in close touch with her, seem to have swallowed them, just as many people to-day are ready to welcome piquant scandal when told of slight acquaintances and distant relatives, which they would immediately denounce as false and incredible if related of some one they really knew and loved.

This theme might be developed at length, but enough has been said to show that in a society like that of the Russian upper class in the mid-nineteenth century, a woman such as Madame Blavatsky *must* necessarily have served as a peg on which to hang all sorts of scandalous anecdotes. So much for the origin of the older cycle of stories. Now let us glance at the conditions in which they and subsequent accusations of fraud found currency.

It is not easy at the present time when all the beliefs, once considered axiomatic in religion and science, are either wholly discarded or in the melting pot, to realise the hard and fast dogmatic frame of mind which was well nigh universal in the West in 1875. In that cocksure age the battering of the critics had as yet made no decisive breeches in the citadel of orthodox Christianity. What is now the creed of the ordinary educated Protestant would then have been pilloried as rank infidelity, while the Protestantism of 1875 survives now only in such benighted little sects as the Four Square Gospel and the Plymouth Brethren. Even the unchanging Roman Church no longer stresses doctrines repugnant to the spirit of the present age; but two generations ago, Christians generally found no difficulty in accepting the horrible doctrine that people were condemned to an eternity of hell-fire by an all-merciful and loving God!

The scientific opponents of Christianity were quite as dogmatic in their materialism. They believed with no shadow of doubting that the universe was a mechanism like a more complex steam engine, and that Dalton's atoms were the ultimate reality.

Then there were the Spiritualists who took refuge from the rival dogmas of religion and science in a new set of hard and fast beliefs. They found at once rest for the mind and comfort for the heart in the assurance that the personalities of the dead survived and could communicate through mediums.

There were no half lights in those days; all was certain and sharply defined.

And then came H. P. Blavatsky with a challenge to all the rival camps that could not be ignored. The Spiritualists were the first to listen and to be upset. The pub-

lication of *Isis Unveiled* and the well vouched reports of occult phenomena taking place in New York created a new situation for them. They were used to opponents who denied altogether the reality of what occurred at their séances and also to those who ascribed all of it to the wiles of Satan. Such contentions did not disturb them, for they had convincing evidence to set against the first group of hostile arguments, while the theory of Satanic intervention could be annoying only to those who believed in Satan. But here was one who, while admitting the genuineness of the séance room phenomena, not only explained them in a wholly unacceptable and, be it said, uncomfortable way, but was said herself to be able to repeat many of them at will. *Isis Unveiled* was like a stone thrown at the Spiritualist hive and the bees swarmed out to sting the rash intruder. At all costs she must be discredited that the cherished beliefs she challenged might be maintained. And so old slanders were revived and new ones put into circulation, while a painstaking gentleman, named Coleman, made it his life work to prove that *Isis Unveiled* was nothing but a conglomeration of unacknowledged quotations.

The man who can advance reasons for his theories of life will always be prepared to meet objections by argument; but when beliefs held irrationally are challenged, their holder invariably gets angry and tries to defend his darling illusions by assailing the personal character of his opponent. The American spiritualists reacted in this way to H. P. B.'s criticisms in 1877 and the years that followed; but it was not until the Indian phase of her career that the ranks of her enemies became reinforced by the weight of orthodox Christianity.

Prior to the arrival of the Theosophical delegates in Bombay in 1879, the missionaries had had things all their own way. With the prestige of the governing race behind them, they could persuade themselves that Brahmanism, being the creed of an "inferior" race, was necessarily an inferior religion, inevitably doomed in the course of time to be replaced by Christianity. Accordingly, when *The Theosophist* was started and an active movement for the revival of the native religions in their primitive purity set on foot by a group of Europeans with Indian associates, the missionaries recognised the danger to their racial and religious dominance, and adopted the time dishonoured tactics of blackening the reputation of their leading opponent as a preliminary to driving her and her society out of the field. In the perfectly sincere belief that a critic of their views must necessarily be a bad person, whose elimination as a controversialist must be sought by any and every means, the missionaries and their supporters seized eagerly on every rumour damaging to H. P. Blavatsky and used it as a weapon against her. It was the bait of a sum of money paid them by the Presbyterian

mission at Madras that induced the Coulombs to betray their trust and their benefactress by supplying faked documents as "evidence" of her supposed frauds.

While both Spiritualists and orthodox Christians had what seemed to them to be urgent reasons for defending their pet doctrines by attacking Madame Blavatsky, the Materialists had, from their point of view an even stronger case against her. If her phenomena were genuine, then their materialism must needs be untrue: the alternative was simple and obvious. The convinced old-fashioned Materialist was compelled to reject, as the product of mere trickery, *all* phenomena incapable of being reproduced in a chemical or physical laboratory. To him, the people responsible for such happenings were simply cheats, and as such, capable of any kind of mean and disgraceful conduct. The Materialists were therefore quite as ready as Christians and Spiritualists to believe and pass on whatever they heard to the discredit of H.P. Blavatsky.

In conclusion, it appears to have been inevitable that a person with the strongly marked individual characteristics of H.P. Blavatsky, a woman moreover, and one utterly unconventional and careless of public opinion, should have been the butt of malicious tongues. But when such a woman came as a breaker up of grooves of thought and as the bearer of irrefutable testimony against the religious and scientific orthodoxies of the day, it would have been nothing less than a miracle if she had escaped the calumnies of those whose personal complacency and dearly held errors were threatened by her teachings.

R. A. V. MORRIS

You can never know her as we do, therefore—none of you will ever be able to judge her impartially or correctly. You see the surface of things; . . . we find a profounder wisdom in her *inner* Self than you will ever find yourselves able to perceive. In the superficial details of her homely, hard-working, common-place daily life and affairs, you discern but unpracticality, womanly impulses, often absurdity and folly; we, on the contrary, light daily upon traits of her inner nature the most delicate and refined, and which would cost an uninitiated psychologist years of constant and keen observation, and many an hour of close analysis and efforts to draw out of the depth of that most subtle of mysteries—human mind—and one of her most complicated machines—H. P. B's mind—and thus learn to know her true *inner* Self.

—MAHATMA K. H.

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

THE FIRST BOOK OF MADAME BLAVATSKY*

[**John Middleton Murry** reviews *Isis Unveiled*, first published in 1877, and his criticism is offered from the point of view of one who, believing in his own psychological subjective experiences, is not inclined towards facts of psychical science, occult arts, and Occultism. Naturally, therefore, the real value of this article lies in the views on topics with which Mr. Murry is positively related, and not in the opinions of a negative character on ideas with which he has not made himself fully familiar. As to the latter, the article immediately preceding this has some valuable and interesting points showing that the occult powers and psychic phenomena have a place in the scheme of things, just as much as the elevated ethics and spiritual intuitions of the Mystics.—EDS.]

In 1889 Madame Blavatsky, while publicly correcting a mistake in *Isis Unveiled* over which an exaggerated fuss had been made, concluded her correction with the words: "The work was written in exceptional circumstances, and no doubt more than one great error may be discovered in *Isis Unveiled*." Her candour was admirable; in face of it, for a modern reader of her work to insist on dubious points of detail would be worse than ungracious. There was in Madame Blavatsky herself a largeness of nature, and in her work a comprehensiveness which forestalls by anticipation all trivial and pedantic criticism. It is but simple justice to recognise that the composition of *Isis Unveiled* was an astonishing achievement.

It was written in a bare two years, in the midst of engrossing activities. As a mere piece of composition, the writing of these two large volumes now made accessible in one was a formidable task. As a comprehensive collection of material of every kind and quality, the work was prodigious. And when we consider that the audience to which it was immediately addressed consisted almost exclusively of spiritists, whom we know to be rather more impervious than mechanical materialists to spiritual truth, and that Madame Blavatsky was addressing them in a language not her own, we must allow that the circumstances in which the work was written were something more than "exceptional". They might fairly be called unique.

From my own quite personal point of view, there are two main elements in *Isis Unveiled*, of which one, I must frankly confess, makes no appeal to me whatever. These two elements are, first, the insistence, with a wealth of supporting evidence, on the essential truth and fundamental identity of all high religions; and, second, the endeavour to convince the public

**Isis Unveiled*: A Master-Key to the Mysteries of Ancient and Modern Science *and* Theology, Centenary Anniversary Edition, Two volumes bound in one. (The Theosophy Co., Los Angeles, California. $ 7·50)*

of the reality of occult powers. For some reason or other, I have never been able to take even a faint interest in occultism. I have never been sufficiently interested even to be sceptical of the astonishing phenomena said to be produced by Eastern "adepts"; to me these belong to the same order as the miracles of the New Testament. Whether or not they really occur is indifferent to me, because they seem to me irrelevant to that spirituality which I hold to be of supreme worth. Occult phenomena—of which I have absolutely no experience—would never be to me the evidence of spirituality. In this matter, the truth, as I understand it, was spoken for all time by St. Paul.

> And though I have prophecy, and know all the mysteries and all the gnosis, and though I have all the faith so as to be able to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing.

St. Paul, of course, definitely believed in the reality of occult powers, and probably set great store by their possession; but they seemed to him of no account beside the spiritual rebirth which, in his language, was described as "being possessed by Christ"—not by the individual and historical person, but the eternal spirit which was manifest in him.

Madame Blavatsky's real attitude in this matter in *Isis Unveiled* I find hard to grasp. Towards the end of the second volume (p. 634) she writes:

> By those who have followed us thus far, it will naturally be asked, to what practical issue this book tends; much has been said about magic and its potentiality, much of the immense antiquity of its practice. Do we wish to affirm that the occult sciences ought to be studied and practised throughout the world? Would we replace modern spiritualism with the ancient magic? Neither; the substitution could not be made, nor the study universally prosecuted, without incurring the risk of enormous public dangers. . .
>
> We would have neither scientists, theologians, nor spiritualists turn practical magicians, but all to realize that there was true science, profound religion, and genuine phenomena before this modern era. We would that all who have a voice in the education of the masses should first know and then *teach* that the safest guides to human happiness and enlightenment are those writings which have descended to us from the remotest antiquity; and that nobler spiritual aspirations and a higher average morality prevail in the countries where the people take their precepts as the rule of their lives. We would have all to realize that magical, *i. e.*, spiritual powers exist in every man, and those few to practise them who feel called to teach, and are ready to pay the price of discipline and self-conquest which their development exacts.

Here, I must confess myself completely non-plussed by this simple equating of the magical and the spiritual. Whether or not spiritual powers are ever connected with magical powers (of which, unfortunately, I know nothing), I am convinced that there is no *necessary* connexion between them.

This may be simple ignorance on my part; but it is indurated and apparently unchangeable. Therefore it is not in the insistence upon and the evidence for the reality of magical powers that I find the main importance of *Isis*

Unveiled. Madame Blavatsky herself came to lay less stress upon them; and she wrote, in *Five Messages*, that "the ethics of Theosophy are more important than any divulgement of psychic laws and facts". Her great achievement, in my opinion, was the simultaneous onslaught which she made on the deadly enemies of true spirituality. On the one side she conducted a vigorous and victorious criticism of scientific materialism. At the time she wrote materialism was rampant. To the ordinary educated Western man there appeared, in the 1870's, to be but two alternatives: conventional religious orthodoxy, and mechanical materialism. Madame Blavatsky smote both the one and the other. As against the merely biological evolutionists, she insisted on the simple fact that the Life outside ourselves which Science examines is but the corpse of Life. The only place where Life can be immediately and truly known is in the soul of man. As against the religious sectarians, she pointed triumphantly to the universally valid spiritual knowledge enshrined from times immemorial in the sacred wisdom of India.

To this twofold effect roughly corresponds her division of her work into two volumes: the first, Science; the second, Theology. As against the narrowness of so-called Science, she maintains, in accordance with the highest philosophical tradition of East and West, that the most important of the sciences is the science of the human soul; and that this science is not, as crude scepticism would assert, unattainable. On the contrary it really exists, and has existed for ages; it has always been the substance of lofty religions, and that substance has always been identical with itself. What has varied is the mode of statement, the necessary imperfection that attaches to the utterance of the unutterable. This imperfection changes from being external and accidental, and becomes inward and essential, so soon as any particular statement of the universal and eternal truth claims for itself exclusive validity. On p. 639 of *Isis Unveiled* (Vol. II) she writes:

> Our examination of the multitudinous religious faiths that mankind, early and late, have professed, most assuredly indicates that they have all been derived from one primitive source. It would seem as if they were all but different modes of expressing the yearning of the imprisoned human soul for intercourse with supernal spheres. As the white ray of light is decomposed by the prism into the various colors of the solar spectrum, so the beam of divine Truth, in passing through the *three-sided* prism of man's nature, has been broken up into vari-colored fragments called RELIGIONS. And, as the rays of the spectrum, by imperceptible shadings, merge into each other, so the great theologies that have appeared at different degrees of divergence from the original source, have been connected by minor schisms, schools, and off-shoots from the one side or the other. Combined, their aggregate represents one eternal Truth; separate, they are but shades of human error and the signs of imperfection.

That is Madame Blavatsky at her best. The truth she utters is vital, and the expression is

admirable, even in detail. One observes the particular emphasis on the three-fold nature of man. This conception—which is, I think, fundamental to high religion—is expounded in two remarkable chapters on Christianity in Vol. II (pp. 123-209). (It should be said, in passing, that Madame Blavatsky's discernment of the part played by Gnosticism in the early Christian Church, and her rehabilitation of Marcion against traditional denigration have been since amply confirmed by unbiassed scholarship.) She insists on the indubitable fact that Jesus never claimed for himself a position of privilege with regard to God. He was indeed and claimed to be "the son of God," never "the only son of God". To represent him as making this claim is to make nonsense of his teaching, of which the all-important article was that men should learn how to become "sons of God". When, therefore, he became, for the author of the Fourth Gospel, "the only begotten son of God," the historical Jesus had been lost in the eternal Christ: "begotten of his Father, *before all worlds.*" There is truth in both conceptions. It is thus expressed by Madame Blavatsky:

> "God's son" is the immortal spirit assigned to every human being. It is this divine entity which is the "*only man,*" for the casket which contains our soul, and the soul itself, are but half entities, and without its overshadowing both body and astral soul, the two are but an animal duad. It requires a trinity to form the complete "man". (II. 195.)

This is the true significance of the Christian mystery of "the indwelling Christ". By following the true teaching of Jesus—utterly distinct from the compromises and distortions of church Christianity—at all times men have attained what Jesus told them they would attain: the sense of being "sons of God". Thereby, they have attained veritable communion with the Jesus who showed them the path; but not with the personal Jesus, rather with the impersonal and omnipresent spiritual reality to which he attained, and in which he eternally lives. To this realm of reality belong by an equal title all the great masters of religion.

This is the veritable world of spirit. It is, and must be, impersonal. As a brilliant writer in the September number of THE ARYAN PATH (p. 653) puts it:

> SELF is not personal; Law is not personal; action is not personal; nature is not personal; only *human* nature is personal. This is so because only in mankind is the three-fold evolution, Spiritual, Intellectual, Physical, conjoined, albeit not yet *identified* as one and the same SELF in all. SELF is *impersonal* in every man, as in all Nature.

Self, in this supreme sense, is the final discovery of Spirit. True Self and true Spirit are given together. In the world of Spirit alone does universal brotherhood become reality, although this "becoming" is but an effect of perspective due to our own immersion in the sensual flux. The process of "becoming" is the process of the liberation of our impersonal self from the flux. The imperso-

nal self is eternal; and it knows, simply and immediately, that universal brotherhood is not an ideal, but a fact. Our struggle to attain to knowledge of this fact may be arduous; but the fact is lucid and unchanging. Our personal reality, if we will but inquire diligently into the nature and submit ourselves humbly to *all* experience that comes to us, leads us directly to a reality which is impersonal, yet most truly ours. This is our veritable essence; and this essence, once known, is known to be of one spiritual substance with the essences of all men and all things, past present and to come.

This doctrine, which I believe to be true, was presented by Madame Blavatsky more fully in *The Secret Doctrine*. In *Isis Unveiled*, she was content with a more cursory statement. But the second and third articles of her "fundamental propositions" in Chapter XII, Vol. II (p. 587) are perfectly definite:

> 2d. Nature is triune: there is a visible, objective nature; an invisible, indwelling, energizing nature, the exact model of the other, and its vital principle; and, above these two, *spirit*, source of all forces, alone eternal, and indestructible. The lower two constantly change; the higher third does not.
>
> 3d. Man is also triune: he has his objective, physical body; his vitalizing astral body (or soul), the real man; and these two are brooded over and illuminated by the third—the sovereign, the immortal spirit. When the real man succeeds in merging himself with the latter, he becomes an immortal entity.

There is to me in this nothing occult, nothing magical. It is simply spiritual truth. I might express it somewhat differently; but it is in the nature of things spiritual that the same eternal truth should be capable of being expressed differently in terms of different individual experience. If it is occult and magical, then I must be something of an occultist and a magician without knowing it. Occult, in the sense of being concealed from many, of course it is. Wisdom is not to be had for nothing.

> What is the price of Experience? Do men buy it for a song,
> Or wisdom for a dance in the street? No, it is bought with the price
> Of all that a man hath—his house, his wife, his children.
> Wisdom is sold in the desolate market where none come to buy,
> And in the wither'd field where the farmer plows for bread in vain.

William Blake's moving and beautiful words find their response in every man who has learned a little by suffering. Wisdom is always incomprehensible to those who lack the experience which precedes it.

But this incomprehensible quality of wisdom is not what is ordinarily understood by "occult". And here is my chief grievance against *Isis Unveiled*. As it would be ungracious to insist on dubious details, so it would be dishonest in me to conceal a more essential dissatisfaction. I regret that Madame Blavatsky allowed herself so frequently to be turned aside from her work of exposition of spiritual truths. That is, at best, no easy task; but it seems to me that Madame Blavatsky complicated it enormously by her addiction to mystery. Spiritual truth is mysterious; but it is also simple. The parables of Jesus, the sayings of Buddha—these are mysterious, but they are not complicated. One does not have the feeling, in their presence, that enormous labours, prodigious journeys, strange initiations, are necessary before they can be comprehended. Or take the wonderful description of Yoga from the *Bhagavad-Gita*, lately quoted in these pages by Professor Sarma:

> That in which the mind is at rest restrained by the practice of concentration, that in which he beholds the spirit through the mind and rejoices in the spirit;
>
> That in which he knows the boundless joy beyond the reach of the senses and grasped only by the understanding, and that in which when he is established, he never departs from Truth;
>
> That on gaining which he feels there is no greater gain, and that in which he abides and is not moved even by the heaviest of afflictions—
>
> Let that be known as Yoga.

To such spiritual purity we respond immediately, or not at all. If we respond, we *know* that this blessed condition is within our reach. We have but to look steadily within ourselves, mortifying and rejecting from our essence all that is the false, material self. We do not need to compass earth and sea; we do not need vast knowledge, or strange encounters, only the unshakeable determination to reach the truth of our own inward being. That is hard; but it is not hard in the way Madame Blavatsky too often makes the quest for truth appear in *Isis Unveiled*.

I do not mean that a man can travel the path altogether alone. That would be quite false to my own small experience. I owe the great masters an infinite debt. When I groped after the meaning of my own experience I found it uttered by them. The masters of East and West have equally been my guides. But they have been masters open to all: books you can buy for half-a-crown. I have never felt the need of any more secret doctrine; nor do I really believe that, if there is a more secret doctrine, it is a whit more truly spiritual than the doctrine open to all.

Therefore, I am out of sympathy with Madame Blavatsky's tendency to make a mundane mystery of things that are mysterious only because they are spiritual. It seems to me that this tendency disfigures *Isis Unveiled*, and to it I attribute another great defect: that it is a baffling and disordered book. There is no steady progress to a conclusion, no gradual gathering of the manifold into simplicity, no final illumination. Everywhere there are flashes of true insight, passages of wisdom; but they disappear. To me, speaking as an unbiassed critic, it is as though *Isis Unveiled* were the work of one who had not yet truly made up her mind. That is not astonishing, considering the immense mass of material she handled and the short time she had to deal with it. But it prevents me from regarding the book with the same unqualified admiration as others to whom the works of Madame Blavatsky are as scriptures.

JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY

Grimhaven. By ROBERT JOYCE TASKER. (Alfred A. Knopf, New York. $3.00.)

It is futile to hope to comprehend the criminal fully by reading books on criminology written by those who have never run athwart the laws. Equally impossible is it to understand prison life without undergoing it. The latter is so well recognized that men, the famous Thomas Mott Osborne, for instance, have voluntarily had themselves incarcerated in order to get a taste of what society is inflicting on its undesirable members. Proposals have been seriously made in America that every judge of a criminal court and every prosecuting attorney should be required to serve a prison term before taking office—they would then have some idea of what an inferno they are sending their fellow men into. You may say that one cannot learn much from the criminal's account of himself because, being a criminal, he must of necessity be a liar: which is as true, and no more, as that nearly all of us are liars when we try to put on a good appearance, to make ourselves out what we are not and know we are not. But an autobiography by a convict is just as good as any other autobiography.

If you would understand the criminal you must associate with him, or, at least, listen to what he has to say of himself and of his associates. If you will do that you will learn more than by reading all the bibles and discourses on sin ever written, and all the books on criminology, valuable as they may be. Therefore books written by prisoners on prison life have a deep interest and a great value.

One of the famous books on American prison life is Donald Lowrie's *My Life in Prison*, a narrative of his ten years' experience as an inmate of San Quentin prison, one of the two great California bastiles. But the San Quentin of Donald Lowrie's day is not the San Quentin of to-day, bad as this still is. In Lowrie's day the one idea was that of punishment, brutal and prolonged; the officials were simply brutes who maintained discipline by a system of terrorism backed by torture. To-day, while the dungeon, or "hole," is still maintained for recalcitrants, ample opportunity is given to those who would make something of themselves to acquire an education, not alone by classes held in the prison, but by correspondence courses offered gratuitously by the University of California. One can even learn how to sail a ship or fly an airplane while sitting in his cell!

Grimhaven is a narrative by a San Quentin prisoner of some refinement who utilised his time in cultivating the art of writing. H. L. Mencken took an interest in him and published some of his shorter articles in his *American Mercury* magazine. Beginning with his first day in prison and giving glimpses of the inside, Tasker's chief aim was to picture to us the various inmates with whom he came intimately into contact: he gives us pen-pictures of many prisoners with whom he cultivated either a friendship or a more or less pronounced dislike. One by one they are paraded before us with a fellow convict as showman. Tasker, being a thoughtful person, his chosen associates were men who, while often betraying the coarsest traits, still had some disposition to use their brains and often their pens. It is a weird and fascinating picture.

The writer is somewhat of a cynic. One class of person chiefly incited his ire, the ladies, the "sob-sisters," as he calls them, who visit prisons with the purported object of "saving souls," but in reality, so he thinks, and it is doubtless often true, for the purpose of getting for themselves a credit on the Book of Life—so many souls saved, so many more chances of a front seat with cushion in the Grand Opera of the New Jerusalem. His scorn for these is simply withering. Probably his attitude is extreme; he had an overdose of the brand of religion handed out to convicts, and it has permanently ruined his taste for "things of the spirit". The chapter devoted to this is one of his best; it fully confirms the attitude of Chaplain Geisert, whose book, *The Criminal,*

was reviewed in the August ARYAN PATH, that the less you talk of dogmatic religion to convicts the better. These ladies who were rolling up a big bank account for themselves in heaven, so they thought, simply aroused a spirit of hypocrisy in their subjects, many of these acting all the phases of conviction and confession of sin, conversion, praying aloud in meeting, grace and redemption through the blood of the Lamb, just as a pastime to amuse themselves and fellows, and laughing heartily afterwards, while incidentally causing the ladies to plume their feathers over their achievements. Theosophists—who have done not a little work among the San Quentin prisoners—he regards as thoroughly honest, but thinks that it is only the bizarre aspects of a certain brand of Theosophy which appeal to the majority—they like to think of floating about on the astral plane instead of being locked in a narrow cell. That aspect was exploited in Jack London's *Star Rover*, and I myself knew a prisoner who used to boast to his fellows of getting out of prison for one-third of his time, while he slept. To the man in confinement anything which gives him a supposed brief release is welcome. Well, it may help the poor devils to that extent, even if they fail to be persuaded that a belief in karma should reconcile them to their fate.

Two other especially interesting chapters deal, the one with the frequent hangings occurring in the prison and the effect on the inmates, the other with confinement in the dark "holes," with bugs as companions and a scanty allowance of bread and water, the bread being thrown to them upon the bespittled floor, and with beans as an occasional relish—beans being one of the items for which this prison is renowned. There is no meal at San Quentin without beans; beans for breakfast, beans for dinner, beans for supper; BEANS!

The reader of *Grimhaven* may, perhaps, yawn occasionally over conversations which seem to lead nowhere, but he will, if he reads it through, close the book with the conviction that our American prisons are not doing as they could and should in salvaging social waste, but are rather helping to turn possibly redeemable material into worthless rubbish.

H. N. STOKES

The Children of Mu. By JAMES CHURCHWARD. Illustrated. (Ives Washburn, New York. 1931.)

The caution with which archæologists regard alleged new discoveries is laudable only when its motive is reverence for truth and when it is accompanied by an open-minded readiness to listen to and weigh the evidence for such finds as tend to subvert existing theories. Only too often, however, discoveries are rejected or set aside, not because they are supported by insufficient evidence, but on *a priori* grounds as being inconsistent with the scientific preconceptions of the moment.

For a long time archæologists were shackled by the limitations of the biblical chronology, into which all traces of man's past had to be made to fit; and the flint implements, found in Western Europe, were variously looked upon as Celtic weapons, or thunderbolts, or as having been planted about by Satan in order to mislead the faithful and upset belief in the Garden of Eden.

When Darwinism ousted the Bible as the popular creed, archæological discoveries had to answer to a new test. Man, according to Darwin, was evolved from an ape-like ancestor in the tertiary age; and into the mould of this theory all new facts must be pressed: if they were unsqueezable, then the evidence for them must be pronounced incomplete. When the skeletal remains of ancient man were unearthed, they were readily accepted as authentic and given an honourable place in museums and textbooks, provided they presented no features inconsistent with the tertiary ape ancestor; but a Calaveras skull or Galley Hill skeleton, which seemed to carry the origin of modern man farther

back into the past than the Darwinian theory allowed, were rejected as unproven.

The esoteric tradition, which is supported by universal legend and by the general drift of recent discoveries, alleges that man—civilised man—has existed on earth for a much longer period than has heretofore been admitted by even the most liberal and unprejudiced of orthodox scientists, whose theoretical position, however, has for some time shown a continuous approximation to the archaic Eastern teachings. If these teachings are true, then all genuine archæological finds, when correctly estimated, must tend to confirm them; and they will require no other support. The man who rests on truth will welcome all new facts. On the other hand, he will never put forward, in proof of his position, doubtful or unprovable statements; for, if he should do so, he would only be giving to conservative archæologists a legitimate excuse for the suspicion with which they receive every new item of knowledge that seems to conflict with their Darwinian orthodoxy.

The general acceptance of the archaic occult teachings as to the prehistory of mankind has been retarded by nothing so much as by the appearance from time to time of spurious archæological works based on "clairvoyant research," or information given by "spirits," or some other euphemism for the unbridled fancy of the author in question.

Of this kind of quackery Mr. Churchward's book is a flagrant example. He asserts that he is the pupil of a "Rishi," from whom he learned of the existence of the "lost continent of Mu," formerly located in the Pacific and submerged about 12,000 years ago. "Mu" seems to have been plagiarised from the occult traditions of Lemuria; but, presumably in order to give his statements a flavour of originality, Mr. Churchward has altered the details of what is a plausible and probable account into sheer nonsense.

From "Mu," Mr. Churchward assures us, the rest of the world was settled by colonists who sailed their ships through the canals which, "before the Andes were raised," connected the Pacific with an inland Amazonian sea.

Mr. Churchward claims to possess, or to have access to, documents and tablets in unknown languages, an ancient Tibetan map of S. America as it was 25,000 years ago, inscriptions in "Naacal" with details of the history of "Mu," and many other wonderful things that our museums have missed. He can decipher ancient glyphs with an ease and certainty that does much credit to his "Rishi" instructor; and he even tells us how certain vowels were *pronounced* by the inhabitants of "Mu"! He neglects, however, to acknowledge his very free borrowings from some of the more fanciful and unreliable of the writings of the late Dr. Le Plongeon, an example of which may be found on p. 34 where are set forth in tabular form the "Mu," Maya, and Egyptian alphabets. In this table, which has a very impressive appearance, the "Mu" alphabet is shown as almost identical with that of the Mayas, which is somewhat awkward for "Mu," inasmuch as the Maya alphabet never existed outside Le Plongeon's imagination—*vide* table comparing the "Maya" alphabet discovered by Dr. Le Plongeon" with that of Egypt, in that author's *The Origin of the Egyptians*, chap. VI.

Among other fantastic statements made on the authority of Mr. Churchward's "Rishi," are: that there never was a glacial epoch; that "the mountains were raised" a few thousand years B. C., before which the earth appears to have been flat; that there are "great gas belts" running under the surface of the earth, the "blowing out" of chambers in which has been the cause of cataclysms; and so on.

The most charitable judgment on Mr. Churchward is that he is trying to perpetrate an elaborate, but rather clumsy, practical joke on those modern Tertullians who measure the credibility of a statement by its absurdity, and are always agape to swallow greedily every new "revelation".

R. A. V. M.

The Education of the Whole Man. By L. P. JACKS, D.D., LL.D., D. Litt. (University of London Press, Ltd. 6*s*.)

Education is still generally treated as something available only in class-rooms, stored up in text-books, guaranteed by teachers and designed to be taken, willy-nilly, by pupils, in order that they may become good citizens. But man is a unity, and those who educate him must regard him as a unity and realize that the well-being of his body and soul have to be attended to in addition to that of his mind.

This is the plea being made by progressive educationists all over the world. It is fortunate, therefore, for this cause that the author of *The Inner Sentinel*, better known as the Editor of *The Hibbert Journal*, very definitely, in the book under review, advocates not only that "education should be the key industry of civilization," and "an equal partner in a community of interests," but that it should also be a system which will connote the "co-education of mind and body," "a complete education both for leisure and for labour".

Dr. Jacks has a fascinating and forceful style which is evident even in the titles of his chapters. Seven of these were originally written as articles or addresses, but have been deservedly given a place in this volume. The freshness of his imagination, his extensive learning and his sense of humour make the book delightful reading.

Not all that has been pleaded for in this book is new, of course. Some of the ideas are already in practice in countries educationally more advanced. A host of progressive educators, who have drunk deep at the fountain source of Dewey's educational philosophy ever since the beginning of this century, have never been tired of proclaiming those very truths in one form or another, and Dr. Jacks' support brings further strength to the movement.

G. S. KRISHNAYYA

A Peep into the Early History of India. By Sir R. G. BHANDARKAR. (D. B. Taraporevala, Sons and Coy, Bombay. Rs.4.)

This is a valuable second edition of a book which has long been considered a classic of its kind. It gives, in unpretentious language, an authentic survey of the early history of India from the rise of Buddhism to the revival of Brahmanism under the Gupta kings, and embraces a period of nearly five centuries. The narrative of the infancy of a great subcontinent and the succinct yet deeply scholarly exposition of the literature, religion, philosophy and science of India in earlier ages, should provide a nucleus for more ambitious studies. The author has reconstructed this history from archæological remains, coins and inscriptions. Nor are the writings of foreign travellers disregarded, and the author proves their practical utility in his work.

Again, the book derives peculiar importance from another point of view. It is almost a truism to repeat that ancient India was the seat of the wisdom of the world, and much of the light that later radiated throughout the other countries emanated from this fount and source of spiritual instruction. To-day, any Westerner wishing to study the ancient history of this country must begin with this fundamental fact in view, and to any so inclined, this book will give a preliminary peep into the glory as well as the stage of mental development that had been achieved in India. The author has also succeeded in showing how desire was even long ago considered as at the root of worldly existence, and how conquest and uplift of the personal self alone brought bliss within human reach.

Invasions by foreign rulers, and empires springing out of conquest, were not unknown even to the early history of this complex country which in spite of political misfortunes has ever been the home of truth.

S. V.

Essays on the Natural Origin of the Mind. By C. A. STRONG. (Macmillan. London. 12*s.* net.)

No science, among the special sciences of to-day, is more strongly marked by an increase of interest than psychology. In fact, if the latter part of the nineteenth century was the age of evolution, the early part of this century might be spoken of as the age of psychology. Though the older or traditional psychology was chiefly speculative or metaphysical in its initial assumptions and given over to introspective analysis, the psychology of to-day is gradually developing into a natural science; and as such it is more physiological in its interests and empirical in its outlook. In this respect the contributions of Darwin to natural science have been largely instrumental in changing the intellectual to the biological point of view in psychology. Could not the same natural processes, which have produced body, have also brought the mind into being? This problem, namely the problem of the evolution of the mental nature of man, is now engaging, as never before, the attention of modern psychologists.

In his book, Mr. Strong makes, in line with this new departure, a serious attempt to construct an evolutionary psychology. Four, out of the eight essays, contained in this volume have already appeared in *Mind*. In the first two of these essays, the author sets forth an hypothesis as to the manner in which sense data or data of intuition, come into being. Of the remaining six essays, four deal, in the light of his general theory, with the problems of reality and appearance, of space and time, of body and mind, and of the one and many in the realm of the mind. The next is an illuminating essay "On Images and Thinking" wherein the author contributes the view that the essence of a mental image consists in evoking the right reaction; he maintains that the images with which we think are the merest symbols, and therefore what is really fundamental is not the sensible content of images but their meaning. The last essay is devoted to a defence of Mind-Stuff, where, in the course of his very clever refutation of the criticism of this hypothesis by William James, with the weapons furnished by James himself, the author introduces the reader to his own "soul dust" theory.

The main effort of the author in all these essays is to make such an analysis of the mind and give such an account of the ultimate elements of which the world consists, as shall permit us to understand how the mind can arise naturally. Maintaining that, if the gulf between mind and matter is to be bridged, the chief contribution must come from the side of psychology, Mr. Strong so re-conceives matter that mind can intelligently come out of it. While the ground plan of the mind, according to this author, is in the nervous system, the key to the mind's activities is in its function. This position, he believes, is supported by the correlation that exists between mental states and events in the nervous system. Hence the facts, that consciousness or awareness arises by natural processes, and that this consciousness cannot be produced by a purely material world, form the base on which Mr. Strong rests his psychology. In his interpretation of the whole world of experience, and in his construction of the self out of what he calls "soul-dust," the author makes sharply a number of unfamiliar distinctions which render his arguments rather difficult for the reader to follow. Besides, his work, being an exposition of a special point of view, has its own limitations which make it necessary to exclude issues by no means yet settled among psychologists. Nevertheless, this volume, embodying as it does years of serious thought and research, easily enlists the reader's sympathetic consideration of the view-point presented by the author.

JAGADISAN M. KUMARAPPA

[In the short space at his disposal our reviewer could not present the tenet of Asiatic psychology, which is that mind and self-consciousness are *not* products of sense-activity and brain-cerebration. On the contrary, it is the human soul that is the fashioner of the senses, organs, and the brain. This is a view that is too hastily rejected by Western psychologists, because for its accurate perception a careful study of Evolution as taught in Eastern Esoteric Science is absolutely necessary. —EDS.]

Initiations and Initiates in Tibet. By ALEXANDRA DAVID-NEEL. (Rider, London. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

To the Westerner new to the Orient one of its most bizarre phenomena is the mysticism that colours so much of its daily life even in the most material of environments. But the Westerner who knows the East from inside, as it were, realizes the deep truth that the apparently uncanny qualities of the intangible and trackless wastes of the immaterial soon resolve themselves into merely a closer contact with spirituality which results from the Oriental's way of living in more intimate touch with nature that guides the upward trend of his thoughts. The object of this book is "to supply those interested in the manifestations of Oriental spirituality with definite information regarding the nature of the Lamaic rites of initiation and the teachings given to the initiates, both during and subsequent to these ceremonies." To do this, the first thing the authoress does, and we think rightly, is to explain the much misunderstood term "mysticism". She shows that while in the West a mystic is a devout person tearing himself from what he still often continues to think of as the good things of this world, the Tibetan ascetic is sometimes almost an atheist and "envisages renunciation as a happy deliverance" and finds ecstasy in the immensity of Tibetan solitudes.

What will keep him in a state of attentive immobility day after day, month after month, and year after year, will be the contemplation of the working of his thought in self-analysis, effacing its own functionings according as they are discovered to be untrue, until the time comes when reasoning ceases because it has been replaced by direct perception.

This book, then, gains peculiar interest from the fact that its authoress has lived for many years among the Tibetans; and she reports that she herself has practised many of the psychic exercises. Yet her conclusions and exposition must be taken with a certain amount of reservation, for though she professes to be a practising Buddhist, she is a Westerner at heart and a disciple of Descartes. In many places also, the authoress fails to penetrate fully into the inner significance of ceremonies and rites whose outward forms she here describes.

In describing the Tibetans, the authoress talks of them as "people who, instead of seeing before them the commandments of a God whom they conceive as being in their own likeness, consider nothing but the law of cause and effect, with its manifold combinations. Perhaps the philosophers of Tibet themselves conceived these ideas or perhaps they borrowed them from India." Their position will become more clear if we read the above statement in the light of what H.P. Blavatsky says in the *Secret Doctrine* (I. p. xx):

> Esoteric philosophy proves the necessity of an absolute Divine Principle in nature. It denies Deity no more than it does the Sun. Esoteric philosophy has never rejected God in Nature, nor Deity as the absolute and abstract *Ens*. It only refuses to accept any of the gods of the so-called monotheistic religions, gods created by man in his own image and likeness, a blasphemous and sorry caricature of the Ever Unknowable.

The real Tibetan mystic, in the contemplation of the Universe, restores in his mind the idea of the Absolute, and, experiencing reality from within, he penetrates intuitively the eternal principle of Nature. If the book succeeds in enhancing the respect of the West for this doctrine of the God Within, and of the Impersonal Law without, it will have fulfilled its purpose.

S. V.

CORRESPONDENCE

WHAT IS DOGMA?

There are few problems which call for more discriminative handling than that of dogma. For the majority of religious minds, the subject is practically "taboo," and for the unbelieving it is a thing of the past. Moreover, not to mention the interesting article of Mr. J. D. Beresford, so many studies, so many books have appeared on the nature of dogmas, their genesis, their evolution, and their death, that one has the impression of coming too late on to the field of discussion. However, since in the THE ARYAN PATH of September the Editors ask their readers and collaborators to "advance their opinions," I shall allow myself to make a few remarks.

First of all, dogma, in the orthodox sense, is in no way essential to religion. No doubt it is impossible to conceive of a religion without beliefs, no doubt all religions imply a teaching which cannot be communicated without more or less intelligible affirmations; but these beliefs, and this teaching do not take *ipso facto* the form of doctrinal propositions. In reality there exist religions without dogmas. One such was that of which Christ and his immediate disciples have given an example. We read, it is true, in *The Acts of the Apostles*, that wherever they came St. Paul and his companions delivered into the keeping of the brethren "the decrees (Greek: *dogma*) that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem"; and at the beginning of the second century A. D., the Bishop of Antioch, St. Ignatius, wrote to the Magnesians that they should hold fast the "*dogmas* of the Saviour and the Apostles". But no one, however little versed in the vocabulary of the time, can ignore that the term "dogma" signifies nothing more than "precept"—a rule of conduct presented with authority.* These rules might be of a material order; might be concerned, as with the fastidious Jews, with rites and precautions against impurity. Or, as in the New Testament, they might be exclusively of a moral character. In the one case as in the other, however, they never left the domain of facts and had no metaphysical character. When Jesus preached repentance, faith in the Heavenly Father and his Messiah, the bringer of good tidings; when He said: "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt"; when He gave counsel for preparation for the coming of the Kingdom of God; when He enjoined "love one another"—he formulated divine imperative prescriptions, but strictly speaking there was in them no dogma. Before declaring to sinners that their faith had saved them, if the Master of the Gospel had regard for their spiritual state, never did he ask them to adhere to doctrinal theses. The original Christianity was essentially undogmatic.

Nevertheless, in the schools of Greece, the word "dogma" was applied to formulas which expressed the fundamental ideas of a system. Thus men spoke there generally of the "dogmas" of Plato or Pythagoras. Later, when spreading beyond Palestine the Message of Jesus was in some degree shaped by the mould of Greek thought, the propositions in which the Christian philosophers enclosed the primitive ideas of the faith took in their turn, the name of "dogmas". But far from being dogmatic in the later sense of the word, they were presented as approximations only of religious reality, as symbols always subject to revision, in order to remain in accord with reason and with the spiritual life. It was only later—in the Middle Ages—that their character changed. Under the influence of Latin formalism and Barbarian ignorance,

* "Dogma" can also have the meaning of "decision," "edict". Thus the third Evangelist wrote:—"There went out a decree (Greek, *dogma*) from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed. *Luke*, II. 1.) And the author of *The Acts of the Apostles* tells how it was said of Paul and Silas that they acted "contrary to the decrees (Greek, *dogma*) of Cæsar". *Acts* xvii,7.)

Scholasticism laboured, in fact, to convert them into crystallised, intangible theories—an expression *ne varietur* of the absolute truth. The business was completed in the sixteenth century by the Council of Trent, which regulated and defined all in the faith, and rendered it impossible to alter or modify anything either in meaning or in form. The work of Scholasticism led finally in the Roman Church to a fixed dogmatism, doomed for that very reason to become unintelligible. This is why, even while continuing to maintain that there can be no "real" discord between belief and the understanding, and that if such occurs, it is because reason or science is misinformed, Catholic theologians have come to recognise that the fact that a dogma is "unthinkable" "exacts from our reason an act of humility and of submission to the incomprehensible."* And this is why, again, even when a particular dogma seems probable, they cannot admit that its authority exists by virtue of an intrinsic truth recognised by the light of reason. "That which produces the adhesion of the mind to the truth is in no way the light which springs more or less powerfully from that truth, it is the authority alone of the One who has spoken"†—that is to say, of God interpreted by the Church.

But—and this is a fact that cannot be too strongly emphasised—if of the understandable ideas of the faith, scholastic theology has succeeded in making unintelligible propositions which bear now but the weight of its authority, in the measure in which it has triumphed, the dogmas have lost their empire. Officially they persist, and, in the Roman Church especially, they retain their severity; but they are, as it were, relegated to the background of religious life. When the catechists give instruction in dogmas, it is to those of an age at which these ideas present themselves as merely meaningless phrases; and when the preachers treat of the great spiritual truths or of the daily moral duty, they avoid any dwelling on the subject of dogma, and have done so since the time, already distant of Bourdaloue and Massillon. In fact, by a contradictory attitude full of grave consequences, the Roman Church, even while she maintains her doctrine with absolute intransigeance, shuts her eyes to the belief of the faithful; and these profit by her tolerance in that respect to take the most incredible liberties with dogma. As for the other churches, it has been proved by the overtures of union made in late years, that if some of them seem strictly attached to their orthodoxy, the majority seems strongly convinced that dogmas, in the scholastic sense of the word, have scandalously divided Christianity, so much so indeed, that they no longer lay their special emphasis on belief or on activities specifically evangelical.

Are we to conclude from this, then, that doctrinal formulas are doomed to disappear? Although many speak at present of "the death of dogma," it seems to me that this would be a superficial conclusion. In all dogma there is a mystic element which, in accordance with the faith, and as essentially a part of the religious life, is of an imperishable nature, or at least can only cease to be when belief in the religion is lost. On the other hand, as water cannot be carried without some vessel in which to contain it, so the mystic element, in order to be communicated or even simply thought of, must have an intellectual container—and this is given by Theology in the form of propositions. But it is clear that if these propositions are not to become outworn, they must follow the evolution of the human mind and be readjusted from age to age.

In a word, going back to the views of the first Christian philosophers, to me dogma appears to-day as the symbol of a spiritual reality which infinitely surpasses it and would therefore that it be ever perfectible. What Claude Bernard wrote in *The Introduction to Experimental Medicine* concerning scientific theories

* Mgr. Mignot, *Critique et tradition.* (*Le Correspondant*, Jan. 10, 1904)

† *La foi Catholique*, by l'Abbé Lesêtre, p. 37. (G. Beauchêne, Paris, 1923)

equally applies to dogmas: "They are only partial and provisionary truths which are necessary to us like the steps on which we rest to advance in the investigation. They represent only the actual state of our knowledge and, in consequence, they must be modified with the growth of science." If such relativity disquiets or irritates the ignorant and turns him into a sceptic, it does not lead the scientist to doubt science, the exactitude of which is proved by its effects. In the same way the necessity of reshaping the doctrinal formulas from age to age, does not lead the true believer to doubt spiritual reality because, in living it, he proves its value.

If the Editors should tell me that these are truisms, I repeat to them that I write on this subject too late to bring any new contribution. But I will add that as we live in an epoch where the most evident truths undergo so many eclipses, it is not useless to discuss the subject once more. And if the truisms of which I speak were more brought forward, humanity would certainly be nearer to union and spiritual joy.

Paris M. DUGARD

SCIENCE NEARS OCCULTISM

From the following extracts of General Smuts's address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science on "The World-Picture of To-day," and from the statements of Madame H.P. Blavatsky in her monumental writings, one can see how all the trend of modern science has been anticipated in the Ancient Science and was known to the philosophers of old.

(1) "The principle of uniformity of nature was established...The unity and interconnections of life in all its manifold forms have been clearly recognised... Life behaves as a whole."

> The radical unity of the ultimate essence of each constituent part of compounds in Nature—from Star to mineral Atom, from the highest Dhyan Chohan to the smallest infusoria, in the fullest acceptation of the term, and whether applied to the spiritual, intellectual, or physical world—this is the one fundamental law in Occult Science. (*Secret Doctrine*, 1888, Vol. I, 120.)
>
> It is on the acceptance or rejection of the theory of the *Unity of all in Nature, in its ultimate Essence*, that mainly rests the belief or unbelief in the existence around us of other conscious beings...(*S. D.* I, 276.)
>
> The unity and mutual relations of all parts of Kosmos were known to the ancients, before they became evident to modern astronomers and philosophers. (*S. D.* I, 480.)
>
> Occult philosophy, viewing the manifested and the unmanifested Kosmos as a UNITY, symbolizes the ideal conception of the former by that "Golden Egg" with two poles in it (*S. D.* I, 556.)
>
> It is a fundamental principle of the Occult philosophy, this same homogeneity of matter and immutability of natural laws, which are so much insisted upon by materialism; but that unity rests upon the inseparability of Spirit from matter, and, if the two are once divorced, the whole Kosmos would fall back into chaos and non-being. (*S. D.* I, 640.)

(2) "Thus below molecules and atoms still more ultimate entities appeared; radiations, electrons and protons emerged as elements which underlie and form our world of matter. Matter itself, the time honoured mother of all, practically disappeared into electrical energy."

> The atom, as represented in the ordinary scientific hypothesis, is not a particle of something, animated by a psychic something, destined after æons to blossom as a man. But it is a concrete manifestation of the Universal Energy which itself has not yet become individualized. (*S. D.* I,178.)
>
> The atom belongs wholly to the domain of metaphysics. It is *an entified abstraction*...and has nought to do with physics, strictly speaking, as it can never be brought to the test of retort or balance. (*S. D.* I, 513.)
>
> It is on the doctrine of the illusive nature of matter, and the infinite divisibility of the atom, that the whole science of Occultism is built. (*S. D.* I, 520.)
>
> It must be remembered that the words "Light," "Fire," and "Flame" used in the Stanzas have been adopted by the translators thereof from the vocabulary of the old "Fire philosophers"—not the Mediæval Alchemists, but the Magi and Fire-Worshippers, from whom the Rosicrucians or the Philosophers *per ignem*, the successors of the theurgists borrowed all their ideas concerning Fire, as a mystic and divine element—in order to render better the meaning of the archaic terms and symbols employed in the original. Otherwise they would have remained entirely unintelligible to a European reader. But to a student of the Occult the terms used will be sufficiently clear.
>
> All these–"Light,""Flame,""Hot," "Cold," "Fire," "Heat," "Water," and the "water of life," are all, on our plane, the progeny; or as a modern physicist would say, the correlations of ELECTRICITY. Mighty word, and a still mightier symbol! Sacred generator of no less sacred progeny; of fire—the creator, the preserver and the destroyer; of light—the essence of our divine ancestors; of flame—the Soul of things. Electricity the ONE Life at the upper rung of Being, and Astral Fluid...at its lowest. (*S. D.* I, 81.)

(3) "There is no doubt about the reality of organic evolution which is one of the most firmly established results in the whole range of science."

> With the old philosophers, evolution was a universal theorem, a doctrine embracing the *whole*, and an established principle.....(*Isis Unveiled*, 1877, Vol. I, 134.)
>
> Modern, or so-called *exact* science holds but to a one-sided physical evolution, prudently avoiding and ignoring the higher or spiritual evolution, which would force our contemporaries to confess the superiority of the ancient philosophers and psychologists over themselves. The ancient sages, ascending to the UNKNOWABLE, made their starting-point from the first manifestation of the unseen, the unavoidable, and from a strictly logical reasoning, the absolutely necessary creative Being, the Demiurgos of the universe. Evolution began with them from pure spirit, which descending lower and lower down, assumed at last a visible and comprehensible form and became matter...(*I. U.* I, xxx.)
>
> ...While the Occultists and Theosophists believe thoroughly in the doctrine of Evolution as given out by Kapila and Manu, they are *Emanationists* rather than *Evolutionists*. The doctrine of Emanation was at one time universal. (*Theosophical Glossary*—"Emanation".)
>
> The Evolutionist stops all inquiry at the borders of "the Unknowable;" the Emanationist believes that nothing can be evolved—or, as the word means, unwombed or born—except it has first been involved, thus indicating that life is from a spiritual potency above the whole. (*I. U.* I, xxxii.)

(4) "The general trend of physics has thus been towards the recognition of the fundamental organic character of this material world . . . Hitherto the great gulf in nature has lain between the material and the vital, between inorganic matter and life. This gulf is being bridged."

> Each particle—whether you call it organic or inorganic—*is a life*. Every atom and molecule in the Universe is both *life-giving* and *death-giving* to that form, inasmuch as it builds by aggregation universes and the ephemeral vehicles . . . and as eternally destroys and changes the *forms* and expels those souls from their temporary abodes. (*S. D.* I, 261.)
>
> Occultism discerns a life in every atom and molecule, whether in a mineral or human body, in air, fire or water. . . (*S. D.* I. 225 ft. note)
>
> ALL IS LIFE and every atom of even mineral dust is a LIFE, though beyond our comprehension and perception, because it is outside the range

of the laws known to those who reject Occultism. (*S. D.* Vol. I, 248–249.)

Esoteric philosophy is not the only one to reject the idea of any atom being *inorganic*, for it is found also in orthodox Hinduism. (*S. D.* I, 454.)

. . . no single atom in the entire Kosmos is without life and consciousness . . . (*S. D.* II. 702 ft, note.)

Now the Occultists, who trace every atom in the universe, whether an aggregate or single, to One Unity or Universal *Life*; who do not recognise that anything in Nature can be *inorganic*; who know of no such thing as *dead* matter—the Occultists are consistent with their doctrine of Spirit and Soul when speaking of *memory* in every atom . . . (*S. D.* II, 672.)

Foremost of all, the postulate that there is no such thing in Nature as *inorganic* substances or bodies. Stones, minerals, rocks, and even chemical "atoms" are simply organic units in profound lethargy. Their coma has an end and their inertia becomes activity. (*S. D.* I. 626 ft. note.)

(5) "Materialism has gone . . . by the board, and the intelligible trinity of commonsense (matter, life and mind) has been interpreted and transformed."

We are at the very close of the cycle of 5,000 years of the present Aryan Kaliyuga; and between this time and 1897 there will be a large rent made in the Veil of Nature, and materialistic science will receive a death-blow. (*S.D.* I, 612.)

(6) "The world truly becomes process, where nothing ever remains the same or is a duplicate of anything else, but a growing, gathering, creative stream of unique events rolls forever forward. . . . . .Life through the ages shows clearly a creative advance to evermore complex organisation and ever higher qualities. . ."

It is a fundamental law in Occultism, that there is no rest or cessation of motion in Nature. That which seems rest is only the change of one form into another, the change of substance going hand in hand with that of form. (*S. D.* I, 97.)

The Secret Doctrine teaches the progressive development of everything, worlds as well as atoms; and this stupendous development has neither conceivable beginning nor imaginable end. (*S. D.* I, 43.)

(7) "Nature is not a closed physical circle but has left the door open to the emergence of life and mind and the development of human personality...the potencies of the universe are fundamentally of the same order as its actualities."

"*Every form on earth, and every speck (atom) in Space strives in its efforts towards self-formation to follow the model placed for it in the* 'HEAVENLY MAN'...*Its (the atom's involution and evolution, its external and internal growth and development, have all one and the same object—man; man, as the highest physical and ultimate form on this earth.*"—(*S. D.* I, 183.)

Every atom in the Universe has the potentiality of self-consciousness in it and is...a Universe in itself, and *for* itself. *It is an atom and an angel.* (*S. D.* I, 107.)

"Man tends to become *a* God and then—GOD, like every other atom in the Universe." (*S. D.* I, 159.)

It is evident from the few foregoing extracts of General Smuts's presidential address that the drift of modern science is palpably in the direction of liberalism and philosophy. So far, modern science has ignored the philosophical basis and metaphysical trend of Ancient Science. But modern science, if she wants to become the "magician of the future," will have to pay more heed to the Occult Science which has the seal of research, reasonableness, profundity and integrity on it.

London PH. D.

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"_____*ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."

HUDIBRAS.

OUR THIRD VOLUME

THE ARYAN PATH begins its third year with the present number. While we are not sectarian, we acknowledge having had a definite object in view in all the articles so far admitted to our columns.

The object before our eyes when we agreed to carry on this project was to shed spiritual light on the problems which affect the deeper aspects of life, to point to the traces of the Ancient Path of the Aryans, the Nobles, whose native land is the whole world, whose race is humanity, whose religion is loyalty to truth and whose ritual is to honour every truth by use. One of such enlighteners of the Narrow Way was H. P. Blavatsky, at whose fount of instruction we have assuaged our thirst; and so our second object has been to show how she presented to the modern world the ancient Light.

Forty years ago H. P. Blavatsky finished her earthly work. She put into motion great ideas and these are fast penetrating different spheres of knowledge and research. If the modern era honours Edison for the gift of electric light on the plane of matter, it will soon come to honour the Bearer of the Torch of Spiritual Truth, H. P. Blavatsky, in the world of mind. THE ARYAN PATH aspires to bring about that recognition by constantly and consistently showing the Blavatsky point of view, the truly Theosophical angle of vision. That noble word "Theosophy" has fallen into disrepute. It has become necessary to take this occasion to re-define the position of this journal in its relation to Theosophy; we wrote in January 1930:

It is very necessary to clear the position of this journal in reference to the word Theosophy, a term deliberately used. Deploring the injury caused to its fair repute, this journal has as one of its objects the cleansing of that noble word of the contamination it has contracted during the last twenty-five years, by a dignified presentation of real Theosophic ideas. THE ARYAN PATH is not connected with any Theosophical Society. It is to be devoted to the consideration of the great ideas found in the principal literatures, philosophies and religions of the world; of all activities irrespective of political parties or shibboleths, working for human betterment; of all movements which spiritually advance the thought of the Race. This is the real Theosophy, the truths uttered by the great seers, sages, poets, writers existing in every nation from modern times extending back into the pre-historic past—not the present current misconceptions clustered around the name.

What was the Theosophical programme and policy of H. P. Blavatsky? Writing in *Lucifer* of September 1888 on "Our Third Volume," she said that which has

been our guiding light:

Making no pretence to float a single new idea in philosophy, religion, or science, but only to revive and popularize the knowledge of the ancients upon these major human problems, it has played the part of the interpreter, not that of the iconoclast. Absolutely tolerant with respect to the several faiths of Humanity, its equal endeavour has been to uncover the ruin-encumbered universal foundation of religion upon which all rest alike.

And so we go on with a firm faith in the mercy and supremacy of the Law to whose fiat we bow; and in doing so we pray the prayer of old—

Aum! Let the Desire of the Pious be accomplished. Aum!

The depression in the entire business world is responsible for numerous phenomena, and among them there are two, the moral significance of which is worth noting. Big business had succeeded in raising the standard of life to a high level and in the Western world, especially in America, "noble" living implied a motor car, a radio set, a refrigerator. Cares and worries of life were ameliorated for the average man by the big business—with its instalment plans for purchases and all its other devices. The financial crash and the consequent poverty, of almost everybody has become a compelling force which makes men and women think. This is a recompense sufficient in itself. Their line of thought is naturally, however, one of economics. People desire to cut down expenses, and albeit against their will are forced to simplify their modes of life. That is an education with a deep spiritual value. This is the first of the two phenomena, and it has become a general topic for preachers and journalists.

With a light touch, Mr. Goodspeed, Professor of Theology at the Chicago University, writes on the theme in the November *Atlantic Monthly* under the heading, "The Uses of Adversity," showing how weakening to morals and character was the trinity of Security, Prosperity, Publicity. He shows how adversity is being practised as a fine art, is taken as a medicine, and is revealing itself as the most social force in the world. Professor Goodspeed does not however bring out the fact that while they are making a good effort to live cheaply, the vast majority are expectantly looking forward to the return of "prosperity". Their line of thought but tries to evolve a temporary expedient for what is taken as a passing wave of adversity which, once gone, the good old days will return.

And that brings us to the second phenomenon.

Economist-philosophers and thoughtful moralists see in the present crisis a grand opportunity to impress the masses with the fact that life as lived before the £ and the $ crash was wrong in method as it was weak in objective. Sense-life and its natural products, sex-extravagance and crass selfishness, have been playing havoc

with the minds of men. Psycho-analysis, physiologic-psychology, birth-control-sociology are in the main responsible for the philosophy by which the western masses live an exaggerated life of sense enjoyment and sex-licence. It is not that psycho-analysts and the advocates of these systems recommend sex-licence and selfishness; but the natural corollary of their theories, perhaps unforeseen by them, is an enhanced sense-life enervating to the body and deadly to the soul. Though the economists, moralists and philosophers, to whom we have already referred, may not recognize nor accept the causes to which we trace the evil, they are hitting upon the correct remedy—simplify life, control and train the senses, quiet the roaming mind, and use labour and leisure for soul uplift and heart enlightenment. We wish these colleagues of ours success in their venture of educating the mass mind; but will they agree with us that the primary necessity is clear thinking and the evolution of philosophic principles?

The method they suggest is that of self-training; they recommend " a new asceticism," "a carefully prepared discipline of life," "a supreme effort to become whole," a sustained effort "to be born again". Simple living and high thinking, thoroughly neglected in the past, should be systematically practised. To such educators the present world-crisis offers a most suitable peg on which to hang their philosophies. But if they are to achieve *permanent* reform they will have to examine more judiciously these philosophies. The thesis Professor Goodspeed advances is sound and its view has long been recognized by master minds. Four centuries ago Francis Bacon said that "Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament; adversity is the blessing of the New"; he also pointed out that "prosperity is not without many fears and distastes, and adversity is not without comforts and hopes". The exiled Duke in the Forest of Arden declared that "sweet are the uses of adversity". Economists and even philanthropists of the last decades do not seem to have believed in that wisdom spoken in the forest, and Bacon's view strengthens the conviction that Christendom has given the go-by to the doctrines of the Christ.

One of the peculiarities of the present economic phenomenon is that the rich who were living on the interest of their capital, in many cases unearned income, are harder hit. The middle class salaried men and women have not suffered to the same extent; most of them had not much of capital to lose and especially they do not feel the loss of luxuries which had become "necessities" with the rich. Between the outlook of the well-to-do and that of the rich the difference is substantial; the former can face the loss of luxuries with a finer equanimity than can the rich, who as a class (of course there are notable, noble exceptions) have been displaying greater

thoughtlessness and unbrotherliness, and Karma for this will take its toll; but the same Law also affords that class avenues of self-discipline and improvement—the *practice* of the grand ideals they have read about, discussed in their drawing-rooms, heard from many a platform and given assent to, without assimilating them. The turn of the rich has come, not to go down in life and suffer, but to rise to the height of their spiritual opportunity and live differently. "Give up thy life, if thou would'st live," says *the Voice of the Silence;* but they will need a philosophy, a basis for thought and conduct. All this is equally true of the other class, though a little differently.

The East, and especially India, steeped in poverty, longs for the wealth of New York and Chicago, as the early European trader and traveller once longed to shake the pagoda tree of prosperous India. The Gandhi philosophy of life may come to this ancient country as a saving force—but there is more than one pit-fall on that road also. Prosperity and adversity on the plane of economics are rooted in their spiritual counterparts on the plane of morals and thought, and Theosophy in this as in all else recommends the Middle Path of the *Gita* and says that unless a reform of the human individual is undertaken along correct lines, the dust of adversity will dirty the soul as much as does the gold of prosperity. Pride in jewelled robes is not much worse than pride in sackcloth and ashes.

How does Theosophy view the prevalence of moral laxity of the present period? H. P. Blavatsky wrote in her *Secret Doctrine* (II. 110):

> In sober truth, vice and wickedness are an *abnormal, unnatural* manifestation, at this period of our human evolution —at least they ought to be so. The fact that mankind was never more selfish and vicious than it is now, civilized nations having succeeded in making of the first an ethical characteristic, of the second an art, is an additional proof of the exceptional nature of the phenomenon.

Why then do sense exaggeration, sex-licence and petty selfishness flourish everywhere? The answer is that the West which has been guiding the march of progress in both hemispheres has encouraged and emphasised the wrong philosophy of life; it has enabled the selfishness of the lower personality to infect strongly the *inner* man with its lethal virus, so that the upward attraction has lost all its power on the thinking, reasonable man. Give the human mind a base for correct ideation and a man's words and deeds, as also his home and state, will change for the better, will become noble instead of continuing in the welter of mean and miserable earthiness. The ancient kingdoms of the Hindu Rama or Buddhist Asoka were rich both in the things of this world as in those of the Spirit, and their secret has its lessons for the modern rich who are struck by adversity, as well as for the modern poor who yearn for wealth.

ॐ

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. III OCTOBER 1932 No. 10

SIMPLIFICATION

I came hither [Craigenputtoch] solely with the design to simplify my way of life and to secure the independence through which I could be enabled to remain true to myself.

—THOMAS CARLYLE

Life is the apprenticeship to progressive renunciation, to the steady diminution of our claims, of our hopes, of our powers, of our liberty.

—AMIEL

Simplification of varieties and sizes of products and of stocks is an important aim of modern business, making it possible for the manufacturer to cheapen production and for the merchant to have less money tied up and less space devoted to slowly moving items. Tremendous savings in many lines are attributed to the increasing application of this principle.

The lesson for the individual is obvious. The most important application of simplification from the standpoint of each man, is to his own life—to his possessions, emotions, desires, and thoughts. Our lives are not purposeful, moving toward their goal with the irresistible sweep of a river seeking the sea, because our interests are diverse; we lack the discrimination to sift out and discard the inconsequential.

Once a man resolves to live as soul, he has to subject his whole nature to a careful analysis, to differentiate between that which is in line with his object and that which offers resistance, to its achievement. As a man preparing for a long and arduous journey discards all luggage but the bare essentials, that he may not be im-

peded in his advance, so the soul must strip itself of all the hampering impedimenta with which it sees it can dispense, however harmless they may be in themselves.

If simplification is to be attained, the criterion of selection must be that which is necessary. There are innumerable things which may appear desirable, but the necessities of the soul are few and as easily recognizable as those for the body. To keep our physical instrument in good condition, fresh air, pure water, wholesome food, and adequate clothing and shelter are indispensable. So simple are the actual needs of the body, from the standpoint of the soul. From that view-point, the accumulation of wealth as an end, instead of merely as an instrument of service, is a waste of time, and, worse, leads almost certainly to an obscuring of the real purpose of life.

The refinements of civilization have their place, if sight be not lost of their true function, which is to contribute toward freeing the soul from the trammels of sensuous existence. Time-saving appliances, for example, are good if the time and energy thus saved are devoted to more constructive purposes. Things of beauty in the home are good to the extent that they create an atmosphere conducive to high and noble thinking. Thus tested in the light of the soul's needs the necessary things, comparatively few in number, are recognized and all the rest can be dismissed from the mind, clearing our consciousness of all the host of non-essentials which have cluttered it.

Similarly the emotional nature must be subjected to scrutiny. Most of our emotional reactions are a hindrance to the soul. A few, simple, strong emotions rooted in the Impersonality of the higher nature are all that are needed—pity for all animate things; gratitude to the Instructors of the race; desire to learn that we may help with knowledge; and aspiration so that its light may energize and guide us. Our simplification programme will invlove discarding all the rest.

Desire is an indispensable part of the equipment of him who seeks the heights. But as a heap of sticks is to a ladder so are ungoverned, unrelated desires to a dominating purpose. To carry the simile further, desires contributory but subordinate to the attainment of a worthy aim are the rungs, held in place and made of use by the side-pieces which represent the synthesising purpose. It is the multiplicity of desires, the concern arising from attending to the inclination of the senses, that draws our thoughts first in one direction and then in another. Countless are the channels into which the thoughts of the personal man tend to flow and many the ruses of material nature to scatter his force and hold him back among the mediocre of the race.

There are as many potential reactions of like or dislike as there are objects and creatures in the

universe. When one recognizes that, if he is wise, he defies with vigour their power over him. He sets out deliberately to use the law of attraction and repulsion, instead of remaining its puppet. By working intelligently with the law, he comes at last to transcend it, in the only true sense.

But the control of thoughts must go hand-in-hand with the abolition of selfish desires. We strengthen the desires on which we let our thoughts dwell, and, conversely, our desires intrigue our thoughts. Controlled thought goes by a straight line to its goal, like the arrow from a skilful archer's bow. The thoughts of most resemble more the purposeless course of a fly on a summer day, darting idly now here, now there, and back again, with only the negative result of dissipation of energy.

Control of thoughts calls for constant vigilance and the practice of steady concentration on the task at hand. To whatever object the inconstant mind goes out, it must be subdued, brought back, and consciously directed to the subject under consideration. It is by brooding over an idea, studying it from every angle, that intuitive perception is cultivated.

Simplification means purification of human nature, the material field of human consciousness; this nature, electrical and magnetic in essence, is capable of attracting and repulsing the invisible constituents which form the basis of bodily cells. The secret of magnetic personality, the radiant personality, the peace- and power-emitting personality is locked up in the process of purification, symbolized in the rite of Baptism, which in actuality every chela under training is made to practise.

Blind unintelligent asceticism is mere folly; that such conduct as that of St. Labro which I spoke of before, or that of the Indian Fakirs and jungle ascetics, who cut, burn and macerate their bodies in the most cruel and horrible manner, is simply self-torture for selfish ends, *i.e.*, to develop will-power, but is perfectly useless for the purpose of assisting true spiritual, or Theosophic, development.

We regard only *moral* asceticism as necessary. It is as a means to an end, that end being the perfect equilibrium of the *inner* nature of man, and the attainment of complete mastery over the body with all its passions and desires.

But these means must be used intelligently and wisely, not blindly and foolishly; like an athlete who is training and preparing for a great contest, not like the miser who starves himself into illness that he may gratify his passion for gold.

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Key to Theosophy*, p. 217

WORDSWORTH'S MYSTICISM

[**Hugh I'A. Fausset** has already published *Donne, a Study in Discord*; *Keats, a Study in Development; Tennyson, A Modern Portrait; Tolstoy, The Inner Drama; William Cowper* and *Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. This article is a presage. Mr. Fausset tells us that he has at last finished the book on Wordsworth, upon which he has been working for two years, and he expects to publish it within the next six or eight months.

The "fall" of Wordsworth is described on P. 656 and attributed to what is called, in occult parlance, a disregard for Soul-Chastity, or what the Hindu Occultists call Brahmacharya. This explanation will be accepted as true by students of the esoteric philosophy. But what school of western psychology will accept it? Not only excuses are made but explanations are offered justifying the sense-indulgence, and even sense-orgies of creative-artists—a view not acceptable to Yoga-Vidya or Occultism. Brahmacharya or Soul-Chastity is more than bodily celibacy; the latter is but a material reflection of soul-integrity. That inner integrity acts as the focal point for the Spiritual Sun to cast its direct and perfect image in human consciousness transforming man into God.—EDS.]

The abrupt decline of creative faculty from the age of thirty-seven is the fact in Wordsworth's life upon which critics have increasingly concentrated. And rightly so, because in penetrating to its causes we touch the essentials of Wordsworth's personality and the qualities which made him in turn the most original and the most conventional of poets. Yet although there have been many explanations from De Quincey's to Mr. Herbert Read's which reveal a high degree of psychological insight, it is doubtful whether the spiritual significance of what Professor Garrod has called "the most dismal anti-climax of which the history of literature holds record," has yet been fully grasped.

It was left to Blake who was not a clever psychologist or an intellectual critic to make the simple but profound comment. "I see in Wordsworth," he said, "the natural man rising up against the spiritual man continually, and then he is no poet, but a heathen philosopher, at enmity with all true poetry or inspiration". The statement is perhaps too simple to satisfy our complex modern minds but it goes to the root of the problem which Wordsworth failed to solve. For he was a potential mystic who failed to complete himself at a crucial point, failed to pass from the state of childhood and boyhood where the spiritual is the condition of the natural, to a creative maturity in which the natural should be as inevitably a condition of the spiritual. Hence when his physical powers began to decline—and they declined early because he had more often lived on them than *through* them—his spiritual power declined too. He not only ceased to grow imaginatively, but he began to die. A true mystic might well, indeed, outgrow the need of self-expression in poetry, because all his energies would be

absorbed and concentrated in the attainment of true Being. But Wordsworth continued to write poetry for nearly forty years which was no longer informed by the creative principle but which, like the religions of the orthodoxy in which he had taken refuge, was little more than a shelter for his nervous and frustrated egotism. And this descent into negative conventionality is the more pathetic and also the more instructive because he was, in his greatest moments, something far more profound than a 'nature-mystic,' in the merely expansive pantheistic sense of the term, because he knew however precariously, that experience common to all great mystics of sinking inwards towards his own centre, to discover there, in what St. John of the Cross called the 'Night of Sense,' the sudden splendour and wonder of spiritual illumination.

It was because he had refused to come to easy terms with life, because he had had the strength to stand alone, to preserve his unique relationship with the universe that he had been able to discover in the world of human experience so much that was both new and immemorial and to express it in a language that was peculiarly his own. Nature he had loved as few had loved her, but he had never allowed her to seduce him from himself. And in this he had been right. For the destiny of man is not to be submerged in Nature but to be reconciled with the creative Spirit which is in and beyond her. And to achieve this he must preserve and perfect his human identity, that unique and inaccessible self-hood which is, when fully vindicated, the organ of the Godhead. Only by gladly accepting and acting out of this aloneness can he fulfil the purpose of the creative principle in himself and thereby come into true union with all creation.

Wordsworth had been a great poet because from boyhood he had known and preserved this aloneness. Even in his enraptured youth his spirit had lived aloof and apart. He had known himself to be, in the literal sense of the word, a singular soul, marked out and dedicated for some unique experience, some ultimate communion from which would spring a new revelation to mankind. It was not spiritual pride, but spiritual necessity, which dictated his conviction that he was not, as other men, for this place and hour, and that he belonged by native right to another and truer condition of existence which it was his destiny to discover or rediscover. And it was because he thus preserved his spirit from the cloudy commerce of the world or from those easy, social, sentimental, or merely intelligent contacts which dim its pure flame that he became a magnet for the powers of earth and air, that the universe spoke to him 'rememberable things,' and that in its ghostly language he divined the mighty workings of an eternal demiurge and sensed the sacredness of some primal state.

How was it, then, that the very

qualities which had made him a great poet, his stark independence, his intense self-absorption, his tenacity of thought and feeling, became his chief defects? To answer that question adequately requires far more space than we have at our disposal here. But we can at least define briefly the stages by which he passed from a positive into a negative condition of being. Up to the age of twenty he enjoyed, as few have enjoyed so perfectly, a 'state of Nature,' or, in other words, a creative consciousness. All his faculties were submissive to and centred in the spirit of life as it informed the elements, radiated from the sun, unrolled the clouds and sustained the growth of tree and flower. There was of course an inward development, a gradual intrusion by thought and self-consciousness upon the pure sensations of childhood. But although there were significant moments even in his boyhood when his self-absorption was such that he seemed no longer to view a world outside himself with bodily eyes, but rather 'a dream, a prospect of the mind,' the unity of his being was never threatened. Sensation, feeling, and thought grew progressively and necessarily out of each other and seemed but human modes of natural life.

And then suddenly, appallingly, and disastrously came the Fall.

He went to France, was caught up in the tide of revolutionary enthusiasm, and for the first and last time in his life was completely possessed by passion for a woman. The surrender was the more sensationally over-whelming because by nature and upbringing he was unusually reserved. He could not, however, resist the expansive forces of the time and the urge of his own ardent youth. *He gave himself and in giving lost the happy singleness of being which has been his since childhood and which, because later he recoiled in terror from his giving, he could never renew.*

The sensational dream was inevitably followed by the bitter disillusionment. Gradually his faith in the Revolutionary Cause and his love for the woman who had borne him a child were disproved by time and events, and he was left stripped of all trust in life and haunted by a sense of shame and self-reproach. We cannot trace here the steps by which he re-established his shattered being. It is enough to say that he never really succeeded in healing the division in himself because, much as he suffered, he could never bring himself to accept without qualification the fact of his lost integrity, bowing down before the mystery of life with a willing submission, in which no element of protesting self-esteem remained. As a boy and youth he had so surrendered himself to the spirit in Nature and known the ecstatic joy of active communion. But that had been an instinctive self-surrender which involved no moral effort. The submission, however, which he was called upon to make was opposed by his strongest instinct, his tenacious individualism. It meant carrying the painful struggle within him to the extreme point where either death must be accepted or new life born through utter self-abnegation. And because he recoiled from the ultimate act of self-surrender which alone could have liberated him, he was to spend his life in a self-defensive warfare that culminated in barren self-righteousness.

It is in his mysticism, however, which so often seems to express a true vision and a true liberation, that the persistence of the inward conflict in himself is at once most concealed and most apparent. In its expression, as in the lyrics which he wrote in the spring of 1798, when he was recovering from the long winter of his post-revolutionary discontent, it was an invitation to men to abandon the 'madding intellect' and to feel the life of Nature with 'a wise passiveness'. But if we read these lyrics carefully we find that the impulse behind them was an instinctive reaction from barren rationalism. Unlike the true mystic who stills alike the agitations of sense and of self-conscious thought that the spirit or real self within him may achieve union with its divine source, Wordsworth was striving to submerge the mind in a spring-tide of instinctive feeling. Later, however, in the famous lines composed above Tintern he thought to reconcile the pleasure of natural and of human feeling, of instinctive delight and of sympathy for 'the still, sad music of humanity'. And he was to persist in this attempt to enjoy the best of both worlds, of instinct and of thought, of men and of Nature, until with the decay of his instinctive sensibility and the hardening of his mental outlook the inadequacy of such a self-gratifying policy of adjustment became apparent. For *the sympathy with Nature and with Man which the true mystic experiences is disinterested.* It is not conditioned and limited by a drive for personal gratification as it was with Wordsworth. And even in the closing books of 'the Prelude' where he testified so eloquently to love as the inspiration of life, the inward division and the crippling self-interest persisted. The 'feeling intellect' which he there enthroned as the organ of the godhead in man reflected the dualism in himself, while his conception of the correspondence between the life of Nature and of the poet was a subtle perversion of that unified act of eternal self-expression and self-contemplation which the true mystic has divined in the mystery of creation.

But Wordsworth did suffer an experience which transcended the '*egoistic sublime*' and, had he realized its significance, disproved the uneasy association of the naturalist and the moralist at the expense of the true mystic, by which he sought to solve his dilemma. In 'the Prelude' he left more than one record of this experience, which in its various recurrences from childhood to manhood was the most strange and

the most real he has known. But it is, perhaps, in the 'Intimation Ode' that we find the clearest definition of it, when he raised a song of thanks

. . . for those obstinate questionings
Of sense and outward things,
Fallings from us, vanishings;
Blank misgivings of a creature
Moving about in worlds not realized,
High instincts before which our mortal nature
Did tremble like a guilty thing surprised.

In this experience we have the core of Wordsworth's imperfect mysticism. The sense of the 'luminous' belongs equally to the poetical and religious genius. But the experience which Wordsworth described here was in a measure peculiar to himself. In these moments which at once thrilled and terrified him, the actual world was not revealed to him in its eternal reality. It was dissolved into nothingness. Only he himself remained real, floating in intense self-consciousness over an immeasurable void. Hence the blank 'misgivings' which accompanied the experience and which he attributed to the abasement of his mortal nature before a reality so much purer than itself.

And certainly all the great mystics have acknowledged this feeling of awe in their moments of intense illumination. But their awe has had no element in it of creative fear. And it is in this significant respect that their experience differs from Wordsworth's. Wordsworth was troubled by a sense of fear and guilt, not so much because he was abashed by a reality greater than himself, but *he was cut off from any reality but himself*. For the true mystic who really sees with the eye of spirit, the things of sense are transformed. He sees them as they subsist in essence and knows that the mortal aspect both of them and of himself is illusory. But far from being separated from the actual world, he is then only really at home in it. Wordsworth's tenacious self-consciousness, however, reached its extreme in these moments of introverted ecstasy. Certainly he was possessed in them by spiritual forces which surged upward from his subliminal self. His physical senses were consumed by a purifying fire, as in some ritual of atonement. But the purification remained incomplete because he clung mentally with all the force of his deep-rooted fear of self-surrender to his separate individuality. Consequently his mind was bedazzled and bewildered, but it was not truly illuminated, and the trance condition which he experienced was nearer to that of hysteria than of mystical vision. Yet a similar condition has frequently preceded the attainment of true liberation as the inner history of many mystics shows. And it is for this reason that it is of such importance in an understanding of Wordsworth's life. For in these moments as he shuddered over an abyss of nothingness and felt at once denuded and invaded by some infinite power, he approached as near as he ever did to the re-birth which might have renewed his genius. But while his physical being was dissolved and 'the light of sense' went out in flashes, his mind continued to resist and to assert its own isolated identity. And so the perfect union with creative spirit remained unrealized.

No one, therefore, shows more clearly than Wordsworth that *the problem of reconciling the spiritual and the natural man is ultimately a problem of achieving a true individuality*. The depth and richness of his consciousness up to a certain point was due to the very limitations of his tenacious individualism. But because the evolutionary principle in the natural world becomes in man an urge towards self-transcendence which must be progressively satisfied if his creative life is not to be arrested, these limitations proved later his undoing.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

Look at humanity around us; it is like the great space in which so many different places exist. What a variety of minds, evil and superior, surround us!

There is the gutter mind full of filth; there is the slum mind full of poverty and of disease; and the stupefied and drugged mind like unto an opium den; and the quarrelous mind like the liquor shop; and the mind which is like an unswept street, full of scraps of paper and of peels of fruits, a picture of untidiness; and then, there is the city mind, sharp and keen and competitive, as well as the village mind, simple and unsophisticated and clean. These places of evil and ill health are within us, and the city and the village are also within ourselves. We must tidy up our streets, and abolish liquor shops and opium dens of our own Akem-Mano or evil mind. But let us not make it a desert mind—vast and clean but unfruitful, in which tempests are bound to arise. Let our minds be like a fair garden, a beautiful orchard, where joy is felt, where nourishment is obtained. Let our minds be like deep mines in which diamonds of purity, and rubies of power, and emeralds which please, and sapphires which inspire, are to be found. Let our minds be like mountain peaks of magnificent heights, from which we are able to view miles and miles of territory and whose awe-inspiring beauties are perceived by men from a distance also of miles and miles.

Such mountain peaks are Master Minds, all Sons of Vohu Mano, all possessors of superior vision. Such Master Minds were Zarathustra and Jesus, Lao Tze and Confucius, Rama and Krishna, Buddha and Shankara. Let us raise our eyes and behold the glory of those majestic mountains. What a sublime and stupendous range They make. Let us praise Them by silent repetition of holy thoughts, let us bow our heads in true invocation, with confidence because of inner conviction based on knowledge so that Their blessing may come to light our own minds, and that we too may become in the process of time possessors of higher Wisdom and Compassion, of the Superior Mind.

—"THE WAY OF THE SUPERIOR MIND"

ARRAIGNMENT OF MODERN SCIENCE

Three serious-minded men separated in space by oceans and in time by racial cultures, in which their roots of thinking are hidden, raise their voices against the ways of modern science. To the student of Theosophy these are echoes of familiar sounds as will be evident from innumerable statements in H. P. Blavatsky's *The Secret Doctrine.*

I.—THE DANGER OF SCIENTIFIC DOGMATISM

[**Henry Pratt Fairchild** is Professor of Sociology at New York University. He is the author of *The Foundations of Social Life, The Melting Pot Mistake* and other books. He is an authority on the subject of Immigration and is associated with many movements for social betterment.—EDS.]

Every culture must have its god, and the representatives of one culture, in their allegiance to their own god, habitually regard other gods and their followers with tolerance, contempt, or loathing.

The representatives of western Twentieth Century civilization are prone to cherish the belief that they have discarded god altogether, and are getting along very nicely without him, or else that they have relegated him to a subordinate place. They are particularly likely to view with derision the gods revered by those simpler cultures represented by primitive man. The truth is, on the contrary, that modern civilization has its own distinct god, characteristic of itself, and yet, paradoxically enough, strangely similar to that very type of divinity that it most heartily scorns.

The god of the modern world is Science, and in our unreserved adoration of it we have made it precisely the kind of god worshipped by the savage in the jungle—a Fetish.

A fetish is an object worshipped for qualities or powers that it is believed to possess, but does not actually possess. The savage discovers a strangely shaped piece of wood or stone, and forthwith endows it with a spirit, a potent spirit that has power to ward off disease, protect him from his enemies, give him success in the hunt—in short, to control beneficently all those elements of luck and chance with which he knows himself to be so abundantly surrounded. He cherishes his new divinity tenderly, perhaps wearing it on his person, or perhaps enshrining it in his hut or cave. He bows before it in ardent devotion rendering thanks for benefits bestowed, and supplicating further favours.

There is no need of an elaborate discussion to show the striking similarity between the attitude of the savage toward his fetish, and the attitude of the advanced intellectual toward science. Science

is looked upon as the healer of disease, the protector from enemies, the provider of an abundant livelihood, the source of present blessings and the guarantor of future prosperity. The adulation poured out upon modern science has all the earmarks of the rhapsodies of the idol-worshipper, and the more rigidly scientific a man prides himself on being, the more certainly does he exalt science to the same niche in which the barbarian places his fetish.

The only point upon which there can be any question, is whether or not science actually possesses the qualities that are attributed to it, which the odd stick or stone does not; whether science is competent to confer all the blessings that are hoped from it, which the fetish certainly is not. In short, can science be accepted as the sole reliance for the achievement of the good life?

What is science? Any idea which captures the popular imagination—which, in its very nature is incapable of comprehending or appreciating a really elevated idea—is certain to receive so many distorted and ignorant interpretations that the word which is supposed to identify the idea inevitably becomes ill-defined and vague. This has certainly happened to science. We hear today not only of a science of chemistry, and of biology, and of economics, but also a science of psychology, a science of ethics, and possibly a science of philosophy. When Mrs. Eddy selected the name for her new doctrine she linked together the two words that probably had a greater appeal to the contemporary American populace than any other two she could have chosen. She consolidated the authority of traditional Christianity with the allure of the rapidly spreading science. Her followers to-day habitually speak of themselves, without the qualifying adjective, simply as "Scientists". Yet in their characteristic attitudes, approaches and methods, Christian Science and the physical sciences are as diametrically opposite, and as far apart, as the poles.

Strangely enough, in the case of science, it is not the aberrant, remote, or derived versions of the idea that constitute the serious menace, as is usually the case; it is science in its strictest and most rigid sense. The danger arises from the fact that, just because science is so powerful, it is easily endowed with virtues that it does not possess, and is relied on for results that it cannot possibly achieve—that is, it is a fetish.

In its strictest meaning, science is orderly, systematized, and generalized knowledge based upon extensive, methodical, unbiased, repetitious observation of natural phenomena. The material with which science works is the physical constituents of the universe. The medium through which it works is the physical senses of man.

Mere observation, description, and recording, however elaborately and accurately done, do not constitute science. In order that

a science may exist the following conditions are requisite. First, a definite body of phenomena, lying within a limited field, and capable of observation. Second, constancy, regularity, and reliability in the phenomena themselves. If these conditions are present, it is then possible to classify and arrange the observations in an orderly and systematic manner, and on the basis of the constancy of the phenomena to set up generalizations. Such a generalization is what is known as a "natural law," and is the most significant contribution of the science in question, in fact, is the very essence of science.

It is clear, then, that all the tangible features of science rest upon two fundamental realities, the phenomena of the physical universe, and man's observation of these phenomena. No science can be any more exact than the combination of these two essentials.

Now just here lies one of the sources of the danger of scientific dogmatism. Some one has said that the scientist is very fortunate in that he works with concrete facts, and does not have to rely on beliefs. This is an egregious and pernicious error. *The scientist must have certain fundamental beliefs before he can start work at all.* Setting aside the somewhat philosophical question of the belief in the existence and reality of himself and the environing universe, which, of course, cannot be proved, there is first of all the belief in the reliability of his own senses. This involves not only the accuracy of his sense impressions individually, but the identity of his personal sense impressions with those of other observers. Neither of these can be proved. There is no way of demonstrating that the colour red is the same to you and to me. In the second place, the scientist believes in the perpetual constancy of matter. This, too, cannot be proved. All that can be proved, assuming the accuracy of the first belief, is that matter has been constant in the past. There can be absolutely no proof of the future, and all the scientist's predictions about the future rest on pure belief. *A "natural law" is merely a human statement of how things have been observed uniformly to happen.* Any other concept of a natural law is nothing but belief.

It is because the scientist is prone to forget these limitations that formal science is itself such a shifting and ephemeral thing. The scientist not only believes that he always sees things accurately; he also believes that what he has seen, as far as it goes, is positive and final. In evidence of this, one need only examine the popular textbooks in any given science over a period of half a century. Each particular book presents its material as if it were infallible and immutable truth; yet between the beginning and the end of the series changes are manifest far more sweeping than in many realms of pure belief. *Yet in a world where science is a fetish, the common man acts upon each successive pronouncement of the scientist, as far as he can grasp it, as if it were eternal verity.*

But the greatest practical danger to society and to human welfare arises not from the uncertainty and partiality of the scientist, but from the limitations of science itself. It is just because science has done, and can do, so much for us that we are inclined to believe that it can do everything. To appreciate the full gravity of this menace it is essential to consider some of the things that science cannot do.

In the first place, science can never really explain anything. What we call a scientific "explanation" is simply a statement of observed sequences. One thing happens because something else happened first. This is all there is to a scientific analysis of cause and effect. The real nature of the phenomena and of the forces behind them can never be accounted for by science. Science can tell how, but it can never tell why. This is because, in a scientific explanation, the cause is always of equal magnitude with the effect, the antecedent contains all the potentialities of the consequent. Nothing is ever added, nothing ever comes from nowhere, in a scientific explanation. Accordingly, when the scientific analysis is completed, just as much mystery remains as there was at the beginning. Science, by its very nature, can never explain the riddle of the universe.

Indeed, the extension and perfection of science tend to increase the marvel and mystery of the universe, rather than to diminish them. Science can never dispose of a creating power of some sort. And granted a creator, there is more of wonder in a nebulous mass that has the capacity to whirl itself into all the stars that dot the firmament, more of awe in a sea of protoplasmic ooze that has the power to evolve into all the multitudinous forms of life that have ever existed, than there is in a universe created by a single fiat just as it is. The treatises of the evolutionists require a more incomprehensible mind and plan on the part of the creator than does the first chapter of Genesis.

The second thing that science cannot do is to determine the final goals and objectives of human life and social endeavour. These finalities can have no explanation; they are starting points. If some one presents an alleged explanation or derivation of any of them, it immediately appears that there is something back of the explanation, of equal magnitude and of equal mystery. All ultimate values are axiomatic.

It follows, that science can never determine what is good, beautiful, or worth-while. It can determine what is true only within its own restricted field. All that science can do is to tell us what is wise or prudent, assuming that we know what is good or desirable. Science is a tool, the most flexible, comprehensive, and efficient tool that man has ever devised. Used as a tool, it has unpredictable

potentialities in aiding man to achieve the goals which his concept of happiness postulates. But it can never be more than a tool. When exalted into the rôle of a guide or mentor it immediately becomes fraught with danger and disaster. *Science can help us immeasurably to achieve the good life—it can never tell us what the good life is.*

It is obvious that the limitations and dangers of science become intensified the more it is applied to spheres involving life, particularly human life. The practical value of science is in direct ratio to the mechanical constancy of the phenomena with which it deals. Where that constancy, as observed in the past, is so unvarying as to give ample ground for expecting its continuance into the future, we have the basis for a truly scientific belief, and a generalization can be made which will serve as a valid guide to conduct. But where the phenomena are as subject to unpredictable and unexplainable variation as is human conduct, then dogmatism in the name of science becomes itself intrinsically unscientific.

There are two fields in which this danger is particularly manifest at the present time. The first is medicine. There has been a tremendous advance in the last few decades in the science of biochemistry, bacteriology, anatomy, etc. Young physicians trained in the best medical schools are admirably equipped with this type of knowledge. But they are woefully deficient in the comprehension of the human personality. They are inclined to disregard the fact that human beings are not, and cannot be, standardized. The typical modern hospital is likely to handle its patients as if they were uniform lumps of matter that must respond in a given way to a given routine treatment. If they fail to display the expected response, it is too bad, but it is really their fault, and there is nothing to be done about it. Scientific medical knowledge is an invaluable equipment for the practitioner, but it is ineffectual and even dangerous if it is not complemented by a sympathy, comprehension, and intuition that rise above science.

The second field of immediate danger is that of economic relationships. This is less of a menace than it was four years ago, thanks to the depression, which, in spite of all its distresses, has served as a useful revelation of the false pretensions of the fetish of economic science. In the exuberant months of 1929 it was easy to believe that the daily stock reports, and the various curves showing economic trends, not only revealed the pathway to happiness and measured our progress on it, but also told us what happiness is and wherein it consists. For the moment, our eyes are opened, but the danger is not yet wholly past, the materialistic god is not yet thrown down from his pedestal. Constant vigilance and much soul-searching will still be required lest the dawn of a more prosperous day dazzles our eyes into beholding the figure of economic science, along with science in general, as a mystic being possessing all power over human destiny and welfare.

HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD

II.—CONFUSIONS OF MODERN SCIENCE

[**C. E. M. Joad** has added to his long list of publications *Philosophical Aspects of Modern Science* which will be reviewed in our pages by Mr. J. W. N. Sullivan.—EDS.]

I can most conveniently bring out the meaning of my title, and more particularly of the word "Confusions," by beginning with a series of questions. The questions are cosmic and secular; they are, that is to say, questions about the nature of the universe as a whole, which men and women have asked in all ages and which they are still asking to-day. "Is the universe a fortuitous collocation or is it the embodiment of design and plan?" "Is the world we know a chance world or a planned?" "Is life an incidental by-product of material processes, a mere eddy in the primeval slime, or is it fundamental in the scheme of things?"

"Is the process of evolution haphazard or purposive?" "Is humanity, in particular, its most admirable achievement, destined to carry life to high levels than any which have yet been known; or is it doomed to failure and extinction, so soon as the material conditions which gave it birth have ceased to obtain?" "Are we free to make our lives as we please, or are our wills determined by bodily reflexes and unconscious wishes?" "Is mind a unique and separate principle or a mere function of bodily processes, which have produced consciousness as a kind of glow surrounding the brain?"

To these and similar questions there has been during most periods of human history a set of fairly definite answers. The answers may have been incorrect; but they were clear and they were reasonably consistent. Usually the answers have fitted into the framework of a religious hypothesis which, indeed, dictated them. For example, the world is the creation of an omnipotent and beneficent deity; it is, therefore, planned and designed. Mind is at the heart of reality, and matter is its creation. Good is fundamental and objective. In course of time the religious answer came increasingly in the Western world to be questioned by science, and by the end of the nineteenth century science was in a position to substitute a framework of its own. From within this framework a new set of answers were offered, equally clear, equally consistent, but utterly different.

The universe was a vast machine without plan or purpose, which functioned through the automatic interaction of its parts. Matter is the only reality and mind is simply an appearance which matter presents or an emanation which matter gives off at a certain stage of its development, a chance characteristic of chemical compounds like the bright colours of an oil film.

Under the influence of materialist science with its insistence on the sole reality of matter, Western man has for the last fifty years been dominated by the notion that to be real a thing must be of the same nature as a piece of matter. Matter, he knew, was something lying out there in space. It was hard, simple and obvious; indubitably it was real, forming an admirable foundation upon which the horse sense of the practical man could base his irrefragable convictions. Now matter was something one could see and touch. It followed that whatever else was real must be something which one could theoretically see and touch. Hence, to enquire into the nature of the things we saw and touched, to analyse them into their elements and atoms, was to deal directly with reality; to apprehend values or to enjoy religious experience was to wander in a world of shadows. Common sense, under the influence of science, took the same view; to use the eye of the body to view the physical world, was to acquaint oneself with what was real; to use that of the soul to see visions was to become the victim of illusions. *Common sense generally embodies the petrified science of fifty years ago, and most Westerners to-day instinctively assume, except on Sundays, that only material things are real.*

Parallel with this belief that the real must be a substance tangible and visible, was the belief that it must be subject to the laws which were observed to operate in the physical world—that it must work, in short, like a machine. As Professor Eddington puts it, nineteenth-century science was disposed, as soon as it "scented a piece of mechanism, to exclaim, 'Here we are getting down to bedrock. This is what things should resolve themselves into. This is ultimate reality'". The implication was that whatever did not show itself amenable to mechanistic causation—value, for example, or the feeling of moral obligation, or the sense of Deity—was not quite real. Religion, therefore, was an illusion, morality a figment, beauty a will-o'-the-wisp; these things were not factors in the universe; they were projected whimsies of the mind of man.

To-day the foundation for this whole way of thinking the hard, obvious, simple lump of matter has disappeared. Modern matter is something infinitely attenuated and elusive; it is a hump in space time, a 'mush' of electricity, a wave of probability undulating into nothingness. Atomic theory suggests that the material things we believe ourselves to perceive,

never known directly, are an inference from events taking place in the brain of the perceiver; relativity theory that the qualities of the external world are the result of the imposition of the categories of the human mind upon a comparatively featureless spatio-temporal flux. The only characteristics which the external world possesses in its own right are, it is said, strictly mathematical ones; colour and temperature, shape and size and smell, are projected into it by the human mind. So mysterious, indeed, has matter become, that the modern tendency to explain things in terms of mind, is little more than a preference for explanations in terms of the less unknown rather than of the more.

Thus there is a marked tendency among eminent physicists to regard reality as fundamentally mental—it is a universal mind-stuff, according to Sir Arthur Eddington, the mind of a mathematically minded creator, according to Sir James Jeans—and the material world as one of its aspects. Mind alone, on this view is real, and 'matter' is the way in which a mental reality appears to our limited apprehension. When the simple, obvious lumps of matter disappeared the mechanist universe which was built upon them collapsed, and with the collapse of mechanism there is no longer a framework for a set of clear and consistent answers to the questions with which I began.

The imaginative conception of reality no longer being limited by likeness to the things we can see and touch, there is room for wider views. Virtue, for example, may be real, and so may be the objects of the ethical and the religious consciousness. Hence, there is now no need for those who accept the results of the physical sciences to write off, as they had once to write off, as subjective illusions the intimations of the moral, and the aesthetic sides of their natures, and the nineteenth century gulf between science and religion is in a fair way to being bridged.

Biology is also in the throes of change, and demands reinterpretation in the light of new conceptions. The mechanist theory which proclaimed life a bye-product of non-living processes, and mind an offshoot of the brain, is proving increasingly unsatisfactory. From a number of quarters evidence is accumulating to suggest that the mode of behaviour of a living organism is fundamentally different from that of a machine, and cannot be explained in terms of it. Life, it seems, is fundamental; moreover, it is creative, and uses and moulds the forms of living organisms as instruments to further its purposes and serve its ends.

Evolution, in other words, is coming increasingly to be regarded as a creative process, ever bringing to birth something new. There is, in fact, literally more in the universe at any moment than there was at the last. The process of evolution is also purposive; it strives by trial and

error to draw nearer to goals at whose nature we can at present only dimly guess, but of which in aesthetic and moral experience, and above all in the experiences of the religious consciousness, we have such intimations as we are capable of receiving. Whether it is through man or some more highly evolved organism that these goals will be realised is as yet undetermined. The answer depends in part upon man himself, for although evolution is purposive, the future is not determined, and man is free within limits to make it as he pleases.

But, while physics leans increasingly to a spiritual interpretation and biology stresses creativity and purpose, psychology has moved in the other direction. Much modern psychology is fundamentally mechanistic in outlook, tends to throw doubt upon the uniqueness of man's mind, and to deny the freedom of the will. This result came about in two different ways; there are, that is to say, two distinct branches of this very confused science which reach what are in effect the same answers to the questions formulated at the beginning of this article, by different routes. In the first place, Behaviourism has achieved unexpected success in interpreting the behaviour of human beings without introducing the assumption that they have minds. They may have, of course, for, since a mind cannot be observed, to deny it, is, it is held, as unreasonable as to assert it; but if they do, there is no reason to think that their minds influence their behaviour.

This, at least, is the assertion of the Behaviourists. Beginning with a study of animal psychology, they reached certain conclusions tending to show that animals were automata. These nobody felt impelled to resist, since few supposed that animals were virtuous, and fewer still had any interest in maintaining that they possessed minds. The Behaviourists then proceeded to apply their conclusions to human beings, who were humiliated to find how mindless they could be made to appear, but were, nevertheless, unable to produce very convincing reasons for supposing that they were not the highly complicated automata which the Behaviourists represented them to be. What the Behaviourists' doctrine implies is that human beings are all body and only body and this the Behaviourists have very ably advocated; and, if it could be successfully maintained, it would, it is obvious, imply a very different set of answers to the questions with which I began, than those which physics and biology are inclined to suggest.

In the second place, the theories of the psycho-analyst while wasting a doubt on the existence of mind, clearly demonstrate the dependence of its rational upon its non-rational factors. Conscious events are merely the distorted reflections of unconscious desires and impulses, and what we think, feel and do is determined not *by* us but *for* us by forces deep down in the recesses of our personalities, whose genesis escapes detection and whose workings evade control. Modern psychology proper, while rejecting the somewhat bizarre machinery of psycho-analysis, issues in the works of many writers in not dissimilar conclusions.

If we are not ultimately responsible for what we think or what we do, if our natures are formed not *by* us but *for* us, free will, it is clear, is a delusion. We are automata no less on the psycho-analyst view than on the behaviourist; we are determined, it is true, not by our bodily responses to external stimuli, but by instinctive trends of which we are unconscious; but we are enslaved none the less for that.

Thus the implications of contemporary psychology run counter to those of physics and biology. Mind, it seems, is not unique, freedom is an illusion; ethics is a rationalisation of non-ethical impulses.

Thus to each of the questions with which I began this article the contemporary sciences suggest radically different answers. Nowhere, indeed, in the world to-day is there a set of answers to which any substantial body of educated men would consent. This *confusion of modern thought is in a large measure due to science. Science which was thought to have shattered the old religious framework, seemed for a time to have substituted one of its own.* It is only now that we are beginning to realise that the scientific framework was raised upon inadequate knowledge. Its strength was that of narrowness and exclusion. Nor should the fact occasion surprise; the more we enlarge the area of the known, the more also we enlarge the area of contact with the unknown; indeed, we are just coming to know enough about the universe to realise that we know nothing for certain.

Some may be inclined to infer from the present confusion of science that science is by its very nature precluded from giving us information about the real nature of things, arguing that because its signposts point at the moment in different directions, that they cannot therefore point to reality at all. I do not myself believe this inference to be just. There is no reason that I can see, why the world that we know by means of our senses should not be as real as any other, or why the method of the scientist who investigates it should not be a legitimate avenue of approach to reality. But it is not the *only* world, and the scientists' avenue is not the *only* approach to reality. Besides the data collected by the scientist there are the deliverances of the ethical, the aesthetic and above all of the religious consciousness. A debt that we owe to twentieth century science is the restoration of these modes of experience to their rightful position as *bona fide* ways of access to reality, a position from which nineteenth century sciences deposed them. But with their restoration comes the urgent need of a synoptic study,

which, acting as a clearing house to which the different sciences may bring each its report of the universe, will consider their bearing in relation to these reports. Hence, in short, the need for philosophy.

C. E. M. JOAD

III.—SCIENCE AND ETHICS

[**Pramathanath Mukhopadhyaya** is the joint author with Sir John Woodroffe of *The World as Matter* and *The World as Consciousness*. He has also published *An Introduction to Vedanta Philosophy* based on lectures delivered at Calcutta University in 1927 when he was Sreegopal Basu Mallik Fellow in Vedanta.—EDS.]

Modern Science possesses knowledge, and its knowledge means increasing control and power. Is this power for good ? That question is now seriously and anxiously asked. Science has been asked to submit its certificate of character and fill its affidavit of conduct before the high tribunal of the conscience of humanity. How far has science been an aider and an abettor in the criminal folly and self-destructive fury of the present age ?

The indictment against modern science must not be drawn up lightly and in a summary way. It is not correct to say that criminal folly and self-destructive fury are the urge or special 'complex' of the present age. These are distressing symptoms of a deep-rooted disease. Nor is modern science to be condemned because in the last century it was materialistic and skeptic, arrogant and dogmatic, and as a consequence of which its tremendous power was and still is misused and abused in so colossal a manner. Behind all its hesitency and its doubt, all its groping and faltering, modern science is slowly but assuredly feeling its way towards light and even spiritual light.

On the other hand, it should not be assumed that the knowledge of the ancients was all wisdom or all superstition and that its power gave perfect utility or brought utter futility. One may reasonably be sure that spiritual limitations and criminal tendencies are not only ancient or only modern phenomena. They have certainly afflicted other ages. Psychical sciences and those that were called "occult," lent themselves possibly to as much misconception and abuse as the physical sciences of to-day. And one may be sure that in searching Nature for her mysteries, the eternal Faust in man made a pact with the eternal Mephistopheles in him. Magic may be assumed to be a primitive science which knew truth as well as wielded power : but sometimes it looked and proved so black that it was shunned by the truer instincts and justly condemned by the saner judgments

of men.

The question has been often asked—What is fundamentally wrong with science which in practice has been found black and diabolical ? What constitutes the value of knowledge, and by what criterion are we to assess it ? There is nothing wrong with knowledge. It is science *applied* that involves and raises the question of value. As the moral consciousness of man has recognised (sometimes without clear definition) an hierarchy of ends of human pursuits, so we may have correspondingly a graded scale of values, leading to the highest or supreme value. What is the highest end to which science or organized knowledge should be applied, and what therefore is the knowledge that is supremely valuable ?

Though science has been misapplied and abused alike in ancient as in modern times history has not failed to note a vital difference. The highest end and supreme value of science was *the* factor that really and vitally mattered to the ancient seers and sages; but the modern savant fights shy, when he does not actually ignore or dismiss this as irrelevant. When he turns his telescope to the far away nebula beyond our galactical system or calculates the spin and the revolutions of the electron in the atomic system, or indulges in mathematical flights in hyperspaces and higher dimensions he is not looking for any gain beyond the actual knowledge itself. He thinks that any piece of true knowledge is of value intrinsically, without reference to any ulterior object. He believes that the chief glory of modern science consists in the fact that it has liberated itself from the thraldom of religious mysticism and of moral codes. It is for the best, he thinks, that science is indifferent or neutral in relation to ethical issues. Of course the issues are important and the human spirit must continue to probe them if it cannot finally understand them, but science is not affected by them. Science is not only content but wise to pursue Truth in an atmosphere of religious and ethical neutrality which it should maintain.

This attitude of detachment in regard to the deeper issues and problems of life can only be tentative and superficial. The savant admires Truth and pursues it. But he admires it because he finds that truth is Order and Harmony and Beauty. It is the fascination of the beautiful whether in his experimentation or in his calculation, that keeps him to his job. Does he not appreciate a masterpiece of mathematical analysis like that of Lagrange or Hamilton as a scientific poem, or a perfectly coherent chain of natural induction like that of Darwin or Pasteur as he would enjoy a masterpiece of Mozart or Beethoven ? Yet the truth he admires and pursues is partial, fragmentary, and very often conventional, and passing. The Whole truth, the Real, has been perpetually eluding and receding

from him. But if the shadow of truth be so beautiful and attractive, how vastly more beautiful and attractive must be the Whole, the Real?

The wise of all ages, particularly those of the ancient, did not consider the position of neutrality to be a feasible or even a desirable one? Modern science follows various paths, but the ancient one converged upon and led to the Centre. It had approaches to the knowledge of the Supreme Fact. As Maitreyi said—"of what worth is all this to me if by them I do not conquer death and become immortal?" The ancients called this Centre the All—*Brahman* or *Atman*. And they knew that the True (सत्यम्) is also Good (शिवम्) and Beautiful (सुंदरम्). This Centre and Reality they also found to be their own Self or Atman. To know It is to know All—the Upanishad said. The knowledge of it is liberation, from passion, fear, nay death itself. "Know thyself" is profounder teaching than "knowledge is power". Such was the position of the ancient wisdom. But modern science in attempting to value knowledge for its own sake, has been going away, rather than towards, the Centre. Any knowledge of the constituents of the nebulae or the atom can be of value only in so far as it leads up to the knowledge of the Centre, reveals Its essence, law and nexus. Otherwise it lacks that unity, coherence, proportion and harmony which constitute truth, and confer both meaning and value. Knowledge is not organized and unified without this reference to the Centre. In absence of this reference, knowledge is not real knowledge and the power it gives is not real power. Real knowledge and power enable us to reach, realize, and master the true Self or Atman. This the ancients called Swarajya—Self-Rule. Modern science has not cultivated this positive, centripetal, self-constructive power. Therefore like Maitreyi of old we find Huxley of to-day holding up his hands in dismay seeing the helplessness of science before the human Prometheus bound to the hard rock of fate with the vulture of unrest and misery perpetually eating into his vitals. Science finds itself lost in the shoreless agnosticism when not submerged in the serbonian bog of materialism. In making for the haven of truth it finds itself stranded. By a new compass (which can only be the ancient Brahma-Vidya) a new orientation and a new start should be made.

Wandering away from the Centre, science can give us facts and laws that are elusive if not illusory, and its materialism-agnosticism creates just the appropriate anti-moral medium for turning some of its little grains of truth into germs of human malady and affliction.

Some of the material benefits conferred by applied science are of a dubious nature; comforts and conveniences have not made masses of men happier and healthier and there is little doubt that as an instrument of real and vital human advancement, it has not come near its promise and pretension. Most certainly it has not ushered in the millennium on earth; and it is not likely that in its present form and spirit it ever will. It has killed old superstitions but has created new ones, equally vicious and obstinate; it has broken old idols but has erected new fetishes and made men and women dance round them; it has failed to produce in the masses of men that broad, bright, joyous and kindly outlook upon life and universe which is the substance of true culture and enlightenment; and by barricading the paths that lead to the Soul—the ancient paths of self-culture and self-realisation—it has delayed the progress of the human race. Moral discipline and spiritual endeavour alone make that progress possible. It is made when man gets away from the animal mind in him. But a philosophy that makes matter and the sensing of matter the only dependable fact, which gives no assurance of the moral governance of the world and of purpose and value of human life and destiny, is not the philosophy that will be of real service to man. It is no wonder therefore that man's moral and spiritual progress has not kept pace with the progress of science.

On the other hand ancient science generally opened and paved the path to true progress, which is towards the Centre. Only such advance can bring true enlightenment, power and happiness. It enables us to outgrow and master the sense-soul, the kama-mind. Ancient Vidya or knowledge has proved of real service to the cause of human advancement. Will modern science undergo an inner conversion and accept the inspiration of ancient Brahma-Vidya?

PRAMATHANATH MUKHOPADHYAYA

Will you permit me to sketch for you still more clearly the difference between the modes of physical (called exact often out of mere compliment) and metaphysical sciences. The latter, as you know, being incapable of verification before mixed audiences, is classed by Mr. Tyndall with the fictions of poetry. The realistic science of fact on the other hand is utterly prosaic.

Now, for us, poor unknown philanthropists, no fact of either of these sciences is interesting except in the degree of its potentiality of moral results, and in the ratio of its usefulness to mankind. And what, in its proud isolation, can be more utterly indifferent to every one and everything or bound to nothing but the selfish requisites for its advancement, than this materialistic science of fact? May I ask then . . . . what have the laws of Faraday, Tyndall, or others to do with philanthropy in their abstract relations with humanity, viewed as an intelligent whole? What care they for MAN as an isolated atom of this great and harmonious whole, even though they may sometimes be of practical use to him? Cosmic energy is something eternal and incessant; matter is indestructible: and there stand the scientific facts. Doubt them, and you are an ignoramus; deny them, a dangerous lunatic, a bigot; pretend to improve upon the theories—an impertinent charlatan.—*From A Master's Letter of 1881.*

INDIA AND OBJECTIVE REALITY

[**Professor A. R. Wadia M.A.** (Cantab) of the Mysore University writes a vigorous article criticising the extremism of both Messrs. Mason and Chitnavis whose contributions on this subject appeared in our last issue. There is much in Mr. Wadia's article that is reminiscent of what a great Theosophist, W. Q. Judge, wrote as will be seen from an appended extract; we cannot however overlook that it also has a streak of extremism—a kind of a prejudice in favour of western viewpoints, when their eastern counterparts are not fully examined. In fairness to Mr. Chitnavis, who has left for Middle East, it must be said that he has not seen Mr. Wadia's article, nor does he hold all the opinions Mr. Wadia ascribes to him.

However we hope that this very important topic will be taken up for further discussion by those who are vitally interested in it.—EDS.]

In the September issue of THE ARYAN PATH appear two thought-provoking articles on the relation of India to Western civilisation from two very opposed standpoints, and I can hardly resist taking part in so interesting and vital a discussion. The dispute reduces itself to this: has Western civilisation anything vital to teach India? Mr. Mason thinks that India must learn from the West its higher standards of living and more material comforts. Mr. Chitnavis sees in this very fact "a danger, the most grave danger which India is facing". Both agree, though through different formulations, that no man can afford to neglect this life and both agree that there is an Ultimate Reality in which this present life is rooted. To a dispassionate student of life both in the West and the East both writers will be seen to err in the excessive emphasis laid upon their opposed theses.

The initial mistake of Mr. Mason in his diagnosis of Indian conditions to-day is to be found in his italicised statement: "The West is affecting the desires of the East because in the West there are higher standards of living for the people and more material comforts." If this is the only thing that the West has to teach, it would be a poor compliment to the West, and I am sure Mr. Mason himself does not mean what he says, because later in his article he emphasises the hard work, intense struggle and "self-imposed discipline" that lie behind the mechanism and the comforts of the Western peoples. His statement is equally a poor compliment to us in India. If many of us have been attracted to the Western mind it is certainly not by its luxuries but by its deep humanism, its love of liberty as a condition of progress, and the superb devotion of its scholars to unravel the secrets of nature as well as of the buried civilisations of the past. I wonder whether Mr. Mason during his stay in India had not a chance of visiting the house of an educated Indian, occupying a responsible position and certainly not suffering from poverty. Even in such a house he may not have found two good chairs to sit on, with hardly any pictures to relieve the bareness of the walls, hardly a table to work at, in short hardly any furniture worth speaking of. And yet the inmate of the house may be deeply versed in Shakespeare and the philosophy of Herbert Spencer and Kant and Hegel. He would be familiar with the latest scientific teaching of the West and may be gloating over the volumes of Spengler. A deep student of politics, he knows what Mussolini has said and the Secretary of State for India has at the back of his mind. He is a prominent member of the National Congress or of the Liberal party and one day may occupy the desk of a minister. He may be a prominent social reformer, eager to remarry his widowed daughter and to entertain an untouchable in his own house to a discourse on the *Gita* or to a cup of tea. In short he may be all that an educated Indian may be expected to be. And yet there are no visible signs of any great material comforts about his house or his dress. Let me assure Mr. Mason that such an Indian is the product of Western education, but he has not cared a pie to surround himself with luxuries. Luxuries as the West understands them may be found in Indian houses, but it is not the luxuries and material comforts that constitute the charm of the West. No, it is rather the spirit that lies behind all this external paraphernalia. The West has vigour, has self-respect, has adventurousness, has missionary zeal to heal the pangs of the poor, has a forward outlook that may venerate the past but refuses to be a slave of the past. The West has virile thinkers and writers to lash the follies of the great and call the tyrant to account. The West has organisation. These things have a deep spiritual meaning and it is this that has attracted the best minds of India from the days of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, the first ripe product of Western education in India, to the days of Mahatma Gandhi who behind his loin cloth embodies in himself some of the choicest influences of the West. Let Mr. Mason realise that mere material comforts cannot be given the place of honour, though they have their own humble legitimate place in the scheme of human existence.

He is correct when he emphasises the need for developing a philosophy of objective reality. Time has indeed come to rethink the basis of our life and to realise that the spiritual does not subsist in the air in violent opposition to what is called matter, but that it subsists in and ennobles matter. The machine that is apt to be looked upon by the average Indian as the embodiment of materialism did not come to birth by itself Athena-like, but has come out of the immaterial thoughts—shall I say spiritual—of its maker. Man is man not by virtue of his body, but by virtue of his mind and that is what distinguishes the civilised Mr. Mason and Mr. Chitnavis from the crude savage of Central Africa or the uncivilised Bhil of Central India. The term "Ultimate Reality" has been greatly abused in the history of philosophy

and its capital letters have had a hypnotising influence on the minds of men. Spirit is ultimate, not as a dead immovable carcase, but as living in the myriad forms of nature, ever showing new phases of thought and power, rich in light and colour, richer still in their meaningful soulfulness. Mr. Mason is on solid ground when he brings out the need for having our feet resting on facts and not on ethereal nothingness. He is a friend of India and therefore has not cared to flatter us by praises of the past, as if man can flourish on the undigested philosophy of the past any more than the son can hope to live on the food masticated by his father.

Coming to Mr. Chitnavis one comes across a typical case of the modern Indian, who suffering from an inferiority complex tries to make up for it by emphasising the superiority of his ancestors. "The present has nothing to teach us. Ah! if only we can go back to the days of Sri Krishna" may summarise the despairing cry of Mr. Chitnavis' note on Mr. Mason's article. This attitude is far more common with those who have never left the shores of India and always see life and solve problems through books, that must not be less than a thousand years old. It is difficult to realise that he has only recently returned from a tour in America and Europe. These countries are by no means the homes of saints. But could Mr. Chitnavis find nothing worth noting during his travels except "the motor-car morality, the cinema precepts, and Hollywood examples, the contraceptive-ethics, which not only connive at but encourage fœticide" and "virgin-mothers"? This unfortunately betrays the sickening Miss-Mayo-mentality, from which we Indians have suffered so much that we at least ought to cast it out of ourselves with all the spirituality that we can command. Is India really free from virgin mothers? If Mr. Chitnavis resides in Bombay the Foundling Hospital at Pandharpur is not far off to study the seamy side of Indian life. Is the use of contraceptives really so bad as infanticide which used to be practised in India as in other parts of the world for centuries? May I refer him to some gruesome details which he will find in the pages of the Census Reports of India? It is certainly not a matter to dogmatise about whether it is more moral to bring forth child after child, till the health of the mother is broken and the demon of poverty prevents the children from having even the minimum nourishment possible, than to regulate the birth rate by a judicious use of the contraceptives with an eye to the physical health and the economic resources of the family concerned. Is it in any sense fair to regard the moral principles of Hollywood as the norm to judge a whole civilisation by? I should not like to waste further time on the doubtful policy of judging a nation by its gutter statistics. I am deeply ashamed as an Indian that untouchables exist in India even to-day, but I hate the idea

of any writer on India focusing all his attention on the manners and customs of the depressed classes. I am sincerely glad that Mr. Chitnavis has not made the heroic attempt to show to the "materialistic" West how spiritual we are because millions of us have hardly one square meal a day. I am glad he has had the courage to speak of it as "wretched poverty".

I should be surprised if Mr. Chitnavis during his travels in the West was not impressed by the splendid organisation of its police, its splendid temples of learning whence issue books and ideas that are perpetually fertilising human brains, and the splendid hospitals where money is so lavishly spent to relieve human suffering, and the bright sanatoria where the convalescent recoup their health, and the heroic adventurousness of the myriad workers in laboratories, who place the discovery of truth far above their life and any material comforts whatever. I too have travelled in the West and I have learned to yearn: when will India have more Boses and Ramans; when will she have her Florence Nightingales; when will she have her J. S. Mill and Bradlaugh to prick through humbugs; when will she have her G. B. S. to laugh to scorn her smug self-satisfaction and hypocrisy masquerading as spirituality? When will India relearn the great truth which Buddha preached: the worth of human soul, its dignity, its right to live and expand?

But I am glad that Mr. Chitnavis agrees with Mr. Mason about the imperative need of revaluating old philosophical ideas. He waxes eloquent over the *Gita*, but such euthusiasm would have come with better grace from a non-Hindu, especially when he has tried to minimise the importance of Christ and Mahomed. I am an admirer of the *Gita* myself and I am prepared to go so far as to say that of all the sacred books in the universe it is the most philosophical. But that is the very reason why its practical importance has been less than that of the *Bible* or the *Koran*. It is too subtle, too laden with thought to enter the minds of the masses. And that is why the petty priestly minds have made a hash of it and tortured it out of shape. How many Hindus understand the full significance of the shloka (IX, 32): "Taking refuge in Me, they also, O son of Pritha, who might be of inferior birth,—women, Vaishyas as well as Sudras—even they attain to the Supreme Goal."

It is also very striking that Mr. Chitnavis takes for granted that the Western civilisation is on the brink of collapse and he has no hesitation in ascribing it to the dominance of industrialism. That the Western civilisation is passing through a crisis none can deny, but this is nothing abnormal, for all human institutions are subject to an ebb and tide of good fortune. Moreover it is notorious that after a great war and a period of hectic activity there follows a period of great trade

depression with very disastrous results. Every student of economics knows how Europe suffered after the Napoleonic wars, and Napoleonic wars were on a far lesser scale than the last Great War. Political revolutions have not been unknown in human history and so cannot be regarded as a peculiarly discomforting feature of the present age. Industrialism in the West has hitherto had a free scope for development, for it had the whole world to dominate, but the rising tide of nationalism and industrialism in Oriental countries has inevitably put a brake on the industrial prosperity of the West. That implies that Western industrialism will have inevitably to adapt itself to these new conditions, may even have to reconcile itself with a far lesser degree of prosperity and far lesser profits. It certainly does not mean, as Mr. Chitnavis naïvely assumes, that machinery will be scrapped all round and the world will return to the wooden plough of India. Neither in physical vigour nor in the output of thinking and new inventions does the West show any sign of exhaustion and it is not wise policy to count on weaknesses of others, which have no real existence. Far from the Western Industrialism breaking up, it is only those oriental countries that have attempted to adapt themselves to new conditions *e. g.* Japan and Turkey, Persia and China, that show real signs of life. Others are lagging behind, since facts count for more than sentiment.

There is great force in Mr. Chitnavis' dignified criticism of Western Imperialism that is latent in the pursuit of mere personal happiness. But let it not be forgotten that the brutality of Dyerism as well as the sabre-rattling of Mr. Winston Churchill is as much condemned by the sober mind of the West as by the victims of their onslaughts. Imperialism of the exploiting variety is undoubtedly a disease that affects human relationships, but it would not be fair to identify it completely with Western civilisation. China was once imperialistic, and so was India in her palmy days. Asoka did not disdain to be conqueror before he became a devotee of *Ahimsa*. Akbar was imperialistic and so were the Mahrattas. The power of kings and empires may pass, but not the knowledge and the culture they have built up. The worth of empires in the last resort is gauged not by the evil they have done but by the good they have built up. India has been accustomed to bow her head before the ascetic—and that is the secret of Mahatma Gandhi's influence even on those who do not see eye to eye with him on all questions. But India has been the land of luxury as well with her silks and jewels and gardens and palaces, which embodied in themselves the last word in luxury. Human nature is complex. It revels in beauty, but it must also be conscious that the life of thought combined with action based on thought is far more precious than the life of mere luxury. India knew this, but has forgotten it in its exclusive emphasis on caste marks and dreamy thought. The West knows it, but is at times apt to forget it in its pride of power. Both need it and, what is more, must practise it as a living truth. On the whole the West has better assessed human worth in recent centuries and so has thriven. It seems to me this is the best that the West has to teach us. It may not be a new truth to the land of Buddha and Kabir, it is not; but a truth that has to be relearned is as good as new.

A. R. WADIA

That the peculiar characteristic of the educated Hindu is intellectual activity can hardly be doubted. It is exhibited on all occasions; in hair-splitting dialogues; in endless commentaries; in fine controversies over distinctions; in long explanations; in fact, in every possible place and manner. This is the real difficulty: it was the cause of India's decadence as it has become the obstacle against her rising to her proper place among nations. Too much intellectual activity in a nation like this, living in the tropics, with religion as a heritage and the guide for every act, is sure to lead in any age, to spiritual pride; and spiritual pride in them then brings on stagnation. That stagnation will last until gradually there arise men of the same nation who, without fear of caste, or favour, or loss, or ostracism, or any other punishment or pain will boldly bring about the reaction that shall result in the death of spiritual pride and the acquirement of the counterbalancing wheel to pure intellectual activity. Intellectualism represents the letter of the law, and the letter killeth, while the spirit maketh alive . . . . . Here then is the real opportunity for Indian Theosophists . . . . . No Rishi, however great, can alter a people; they must alter themselves . . . . . The West is bad enough, the heavens know, but out of badness—the *râjasika* quality—there is a rising up to truth; from *tamogunam* comes only death. If there are men in India with the diamond hearts possessed by the martyrs of the ages, I call upon them from across these oceans that roll between us to rise and to tell their fellow Theosophists and their country what they ought to know. If such men are there they will, of themselves, know what words to use, for the Spirit will, in that day and hour, give the words and the influence.

W. Q. JUDGE, *The Theosophist* (September 1893)

THE SOUL ON THE STAGE

[R. H. B. writes out of long experience as an actor in America and England. This article is a fruit of reminiscence, in retirement, of stage-life.—EDS.]

The Way is open to all. It begins wherever one is, in whatever place, time, or condition. When the time is ripe for the heart to hear the divine message, the place is ready, and the conditions are transformable to the awakened will. And whether the path be that of knowledge—gnani-yoga; or the path of action—karma-yoga; or the path of devotion—bhakti-yoga, matters not in the least, since these all ultimately blend in the one great Raja-yoga, the Kingly Wisdom, which is not different in any way from absolute Compassion.

To an actor, the path at first sight, would seem to be that of karma-yoga. By his action he lives, his acting, good or bad, determines his standing in his profession, but this again is determined partly, by his temperament and opportunities. The sum of past emotions and experiences has led to, in fact has created, the present; how he uses the present will make future opportunities. The profession of acting, like other things, has four natural divisions. They may be said to correspond to the four castes of ancient India. For instance, the actor may begin as a "super" one of the mob, a spear-carrier, a servant. If he is prompt, reliable, efficient, he is promoted to what is called a "utility man," he has real wages, is a commodity of use, to be bought and sold in play-production, he may be said to correspond to the vaishya at this stage. And just beyond this—quite a distance beyond in value, though it is but the next step—is the actor who has learned not only how to discern and evaluate meanings, but to "contend for the shade of a word and a thing not seen with the eyes". This brings him into the class of a kshatriya—one who fights for his ideals, and defends those of others. By this type, the real meaning of an author is brought out, the balance of dramatic force is sustained, the true message of a play is preserved. At this stage the actor projects from the plane of the noumenal to the plane of the phenomenal the living character, lending it his own life-force in the process. At this stage, too, the actor in his own private life, often becomes aware that as his capacities are greater, so his responsibilities are heavier than those of others, and he may contend for the rights of all, which may bring about better conditions in the theatre-world.

It was this type of man and woman by the way who, banding together at their Kshatriya stage of development, originated the Actors Equity Association in America, greatly helped by the American Federation of Labour. Many old wrongs were righted and abuses corrected by those

who fought not for themselves only but for all their profession, even for those who stood aloof. From what has been called the Kshatriya stage, again it is but a step to the very great actor who can teach by word and example, who can make others act, who can call out their own powers by the fire, the conviction, the reality of his own conceptions. He is the highest caste, the head of his profession. For him there are no laws, he discovers his own laws, having worked up through and transcended all the conventions, and come into the realm of the creators, working in harmony with natural law itself.

It has often been said that there are two types of actors: the one composed of those who "live" their parts, become immersed in them, even submerge their own personalities in them, torn by the emotions they portray to the point of being unbalanced for the time; and the other type who call up and stimulate emotion by their own will, suggest it to the audience who are made to feel what is necessary to the situation, while the actor, cool, self-possessed, is merely the transmitter of the effect produced. There have been great actors of each type, the first, a medium between the author and the audience, the other an interpreter to it, as it were. In the first the actor does the audience's thinking and feeling for it, and wonders why it remains "cold" to him. In the other the audience itself is moved to feel and think as the author meant it should, and the actor while faithfully conveying the meaning, is not affected emotionally by what he has passed through in portraying it. The first is swept away by the passions of his part, the second sweeps the audience by them; the one is the more or less unconscious medium, the other the conscious mediator between author and audience.

At whatever stage of his development, the actor encounters the Theosophic teaching, it is bound to make a great difference to him. He can no longer be a passive agent and drift with the tide. He knows that his ultimate destiny is in his own hands, even though his immediate circumstances may still show the shackles of Karma. He realises that he can begin from wherever he is, to follow in the path of those who have become the Path. He knows where he is going, and that he is on the way, however far ahead the goal may be. The dangers that lie along the way,—the dangers of vanity, ambition, conceit, pride, the sense of personal egotism, the illusion of greatness, although they exist, are lessened for him by reason of the knowledge he has contacted, the glimpse of reality which he has caught. Only that endures which is Real. He is able to stand a little aloof from his personal experiences, on or off the stage, and view them in their right perspective. He culls a certain knowledge from each character he portrays, just as the divine Ego, the enduring life, stores the

efflorescence of all the lives it lives. His work is sure to broaden and deepen, his life is certain to show it. His horizons are always lifting to loftier altitudes. Vision, hope, purpose, endow him with ever-beckoning possibilities. The parts he originates will be participators in this increased individuality; his instinct will develop into intuition; his acting grow into power, his knowledge into love. Thus the paths merge. Thus they become one service—the longing to give to humanity all that oneself has seen, known, loved. It is possible for the great actor, the great orator, by the mighty power of the spoken word, the uttered thought, to make an audience *one* as perhaps nothing else does.

All along the way of his development, the actor has had to learn great lessons in little things—to subordinate his part to the whole; that it is the *play* which counts, its right values that must be brought out, the interests of others served; until there comes to him a deliberate selflessness, a conscious magic in this world of illusion. Illusion? What is that? Is not the ideal world he creates more real than the actual at least for the time being? The minds and hearts of men are the instruments on which he plays the theme he has been set to interpret. He can move them and lift them at will. He can by the magic wand of imagination, make them transcend their little lives because his service is a consecration.

And at the end of the play, whether he lays down the clown's hoop, or the king's crown, he will know that neither is himself, just as his own present life is not himself, but a part of the Great Self, the One Life. He will know that he has not fully expressed it, that his very best was imperfect, was but a becoming. And in the rests between lives he will

> in far Elysian fields
> Dream, without sorrow of the days that were

and build ever better for the good, the true, and the beautiful, each time he returns to work.

Thus, it does not matter where the path begins. It begins where one is; yet it leads straight away from where one is. In Hamlet's words—

> If it be now, 'tis not to come;
> If it be not to come, it will be now,
> If it be not now, yet it will come:
> The readiness is all.

The readiness is all.

R. H. B.

TRUTH AND SUPERSTITION

[**G. B. Harrison, M. A. (Cantab.), Ph. D. (London)**, is author of several volumes among them *The Lancaster Witches 1612.* He wrote on "Modern Superstitions" in our pages last February.—EDS.]

Superstition may be defined as active credulity, showing itself either in the expectation of results from certain actions or conversely in the performance of illogical acts to produce results. The difference between the credulous man and the scientific is that the one jumps from cause to result, the other to his own satisfaction by reason, experiment, and deduction traces the links between the first and the final event. Both have faith in their own judgment, the one in his own intuition or conviction, the other in his power of observation. Yet human knowledge is very narrowly limited, depending upon a minute experience of an infinitely varied universe. A new ingredient added to the mass of experience will often alter the blend so that the science of one generation becomes the superstition of the next. In material science new instruments make for preciser knowledge; but in the realm of ideas the differences between one generation and another are as often as not in expression and statement, new notions being but new labels for what was long ago perceived and comprehended. Longinus understood the 'lyric moment' as well as any modern critic.

Empiric knowledge is usually disgusting to the professed scientist, who will harry those who claim it. Registered doctors of medicine conscientiously persecute the unregistered healer as a quack, excommunicating any of their brethren who aid the pariah, in part that the community may be protected from humbugs, partly also to defend their own priestly caste. Yet men know many more things than they can explain, and even the exactest knowledge ultimately depends on two fallible humans, the instrument maker and the observer. Moreover scientists of great repute will think in terms which make puny the wildest speculations of theologians. Astronomers in computing the intervals between the heavenly bodies use a 'million light-years' as a unit of measurement; at such distances faith and fact are alike insignificant.

Experience has an uncomfortable way of supporting superstition against reason. As a small boy I had some lessons in this fact. Once I cut my finger nails on a Sunday, and was told by a horrified elder that it was an unlucky act—

> Best a man had ne'er been born
> Than have his nails on a Sunday shorn;

and sure enough I got into all manner of trouble on the Monday. Another time I made myself a ring from some old leather. For

some quite unaccountable reason I felt convinced that the ring was unlucky. The next week was full of troubles. I therefore hid the ring in a drawer and forgot it. Weeks after I came upon it and threw away the wretched thing lest it should bring more trouble; next day was again notably disastrous.

This kind of passive superstition is probably due to crude reasoning. Misfortune is repeated. The mind looking for a cause turns to memory, and the only precedent events which can be recalled are that before each misfortune the same omen was observed, crossed knives maybe. Therefore crossed knives were the cause; and if trouble should again follow crossed knives no amount of reasoning will finally eradicate that superstition. The reasonable man would go on to prove this deduction to be false by crossing his knives at every meal; but superstitions of this kind arise from fear, and fear is the natural antipathy to reason.

Superstitions of fear are not necessarily bad. Such moral laws as existed in the Greek religion were largely based on the superstition that a man should mind his words and acts lest they came back at him.' Even the superstition that thirteen must never sit down together at a feast has its not altogether degraded side. The last supper when Jesus sat with his twelve disciples was the immediate prologue to Calvary, and Judas who first rose was dead within a few hours; one should be careful to avoid every circumstance of such a tragedy.

Active superstition may likewise have its defence. Many practices which cannot be proved reasonable may yet be based upon intuitive or partial knowledge; though empiric knowledge of this kind is hardly to be distinguished from mere credulity, an eagerness to be deceived and a distaste for the effort of reasoning. There are countless specimens in this kind, particularly in the cures of minor ailments. Some hold, for instance, that to avoid the rheumatism one should carry a piece of sulphur on the person; this belief may be mere superstition, the sulphur being a form of talisman, but equally it may be that there is some property in sulphur as yet not identified. Other treatments are at first sight sheer superstition. One, whom I knew, was suffering from a wart. She was advised by an old village woman to take a dried bean, rub it on the wart, and then hide it secretly in an unseemly place; and the wart did disappear !

With most of these practices fuller knowledge will usually confirm that the remedy was simply superstitious, and the result if not entirely fortuitous, was due to the stimulus given to the mind by self-deception. And yet the wildest of odd practices sometimes are justified by scientists. It is said that ancient Greek physicians prescribed as a cure for goitre the ashes of a burnt sea sponge; but the ashes contained

iodine which is the modern remedy for the complaint. The interesting speculation here is to discover by what process of reasoning or intuition the Greek doctor was led to experiment with so unlikely a substance. Similarly the use of digitalis (or foxglove) for complaints of the heart was a remedy of witches. A village doctor—so the story goes—finding that his patients gained more relief from the local wise woman than from himself had the courage to consult the witch and win from her the formula, which included many useless simples but among them foxglove. The foxglove was thus admitted to the pharmacopœia and, as it were, baptised late respectability.

Superstitions are most gross and frequent in that part of experience which is called religion; and here especially one should be chary of passing hasty or indeed any judgment. Religion is pre-eminently concerned with those experiences which are least definable or communicable, and yet most vital. It is impossible for one man to enter into the experiences of another, and to know what others feel or see. The man who has felt an over-powering religious experience will go through any antics to recapture it, whilst those who have never known the experience will look upon him with amazement and disgust. Most religious bitterness, intolerance, persecutions and even wars arise from the simple ignoring of the fact that men's experiences and capabilities of experience differ, and that no great emotion can ever be fully expressed.

Nor is there, apparently, any reconciliation possible between the two kinds of mind. The enthusiast has felt the emotion but is unable, and indeed seldom wishes to analyse its causes objectively. The rationalist is incapable of enthusiasm. The wise man can only recognise that the fundamental difference exists; whilst rejecting the explanation he realises that the enthusiast has indeed enjoyed the experience; and on the other hand, whilst accepting the rationalist's objections, he realises also that the rationalist's emotional capacity is underdeveloped.

Religious ritual is not superstitious in itself, but it soon degenerates into superstition when the worshipper ceases to be conscious, in his reason or his emotions, of that which it symbolises or evokes. Psychologists may explain religious experiences in their own terms of suggestion and hysteria, but the experience itself belongs only to those who have felt it. Unfortunately it is rare for the two kinds of mind—the emotional which experiences and the rational which analyses—to exist in one person, so that the rational mind usually lacks the experience or even a comprehension of the experience; for indeed this process of analysing is the surest way of frustrating emotional experience.

Fundamentally this is ultimately the difference between the Catholic and the Protestant mind. The one believes intuitively, the

other by his own process of reasoning. The experiences of the Catholic are so indefinable in terms of logic that his dogmas can soon be reduced to nonsense by the unbeliever; but only a fool would seriously challenge a Catholic to submit the consecrated wafer to chemical analysis. On the other side the Protestant who regards Catholic ritual and practice as idolatry is himself equally credulous when he bases his faith on a book to which he attaches supernatural powers. Idolatry and bibliolatry are equally superstitious.

Much of the difficulty in discussing religious ideas came from the inadequacy of words as a medium for expression or exchange of thought. Language is a sensitive and various instrument, and few can use or hear it with precision. Even the same idea may be expressed in different forms so that in one it is enlightened truth, in the other barbarity. Thus, to speak of the prophyllaxis of smallpox by vaccination is eminently hygienic, but express it in the terms of an old wife's recipe book—"To prevent the small pocks, scratch the left arm of an infant with an needle and into the wound rub some pus taken from a cow that the cow pocks, and for seven years that infant shall never suffer from the small pocks". The process is the same; one formula is disgusting, the other evokes no emotion. Even the simplest of actions cannot be completely transmuted into words. Vaughan, moved to an ecstasy of an *o altitudo*, wrote:—

I saw Eternity the other night,
Like a great Ring of pure and endless light,
All calm, as it was bright;
And round beneath it Time in hours, days,
years,

Driven by the spheres
Like a vast shadow moved . . .

As an expression of emotion this is magnificent, but how inaccurate as an expression of scientific fact! How hardly can we share the subtle thoughts of each other.

Moreover truth has no clear edges, being like the colours in the rainbow wherein can be distinguished red and blue and yellow, but no one can say where one blends into the other. Some years ago a traveller on his return to England described a certain mountain as notably shaped like a lump of sugar. Whereupon another traveller declared that, on the contrary, the mountain had a peak like a cone; but both travellers were absolved from lying when a third said that from the North the mountain was indeed square topped, but from the East conical. This is a parable of Truth.

So with superstition. It may be defined as active credulity; but passive incredulity is equally superstitious.

G. B. HARRISON

DOSTOEVSKY'S AFFINITIES WITH BUDDHISM

[**Philip Henderson's** article reminds us of the efforts of Madame H. P. Blavatsky to bring to the notice of the English reading public *The Brothers Karamazov*. Dostoevsky's death in February 1881 was hardly mentioned in the British press, and only since 1885 when his *Crime and Punishment* first appeared in English that he became known in Britain. The early translations were not from the original but from French. H. P. Blavatsky translated directly from Russian and published a long extract from *The Brothers Karamazov* in *The Theosophist* for November and December 1881, describing it as "a cutting satire on modern theology generally and the Roman Catholic religion in particular". She called Dostoevsky "one of the ablest and profoundest among Russian writers".—EDS.]

Fyodor Dostoevsky is often referred to as a great psychological realist by those who use the word "psychological" to describe mental processes. Actually, however, his work has a far greater significance. His spiritual life was so intense that his characters are less "people," as in the work of most novelists, than disembodied souls inhabiting a timeless world. Thus to call him a psychological realist, in the material sense of the psycho-analysts, is to misjudge his profundity as a thinker. Indeed, the world of phenomena scarcely exists in Dostoevksy's novels, the action taking place almost wholly within his characters' minds. And even when he does introduce a background of objects, they are so charged with spiritual overtones that they are little more than symbols of states of soul. His landscapes, streets, houses, are like things in a dream. In short, his world is the metaphysical world of the self in relation to which all phenomena are seen as illusory; and he is a psychological realist in the sense of the psyche and the Real. It is from this point that any serious consideration of Dostoevsky as a thinker must begin.

The great events that subsequently determined the whole course of Dostoevsky's mental life occurred in 1849 when, at the age of twenty-seven, he was taken out to be shot as a member of a revolutionary political society. During the few seconds that elapsed before his reprieve, waiting for death, he had already begun to live in eternity. That moment of vision permanently altered his whole perspective and never afterwards did he quite regain the "normal" sense of time. Then for four years he was imprisoned in Siberia. These were Dostoevsky's years in the wilderness, during which he was continually face to face with himself. The significance of this period in his inner history is that it contains the death sentence to his old way of life before his arrest, and what may be regarded as his initiation; that self-searching and that deep humiliation from which was born his pity for the sufferings of mankind. Had not these particular events come upon him, he would un-

doubtedly have experienced their counterpart. For it was not that "he had the opportunity to be profound," as is sometimes cynically suggested, it is not that he was "pathological," that matters: these events show him to have reached a stage of inner evolution when it was no longer possible for him to go on writing of temporal social problems, as in *Poor Folk*. Henceforth he was face to face with eternal problems within himself. Henceforth he ceased to be a novelist, although he continued to use the novel form. He became a metaphysical writer and a mystic.

During his imprisonment, Dostoevsky was thinking out his novel *Crime and Punishment*, in which he exposed the bankruptcy of the conception of the superman, the illusion of self-will and the ultimate sterility of the intellect as a means of attaining to truth.

Incidentally, I would point out here, that in describing Raskolnikov's state of mind at the end of *Crime and Punishment*, Dostoevsky writes:

> Everything, even his crime and sentence, and imprisonment seemed to him now . . . an external, strange fact, with which he had no concern.

a statement that obviously mirrors Dostoevsky's own attitude of mind towards his past sufferings, and one which reveals his perception of the fact that the soul remains unchanged by suffering, although we ourselves in our mortal natures may then be brought to a greater consciousness of it.

But for Dostoevsky intellect *qua* intellect, as in the teaching of the Buddha, was one of the diabolical principles in life. It is his own intellect personified that becomes Ivan Karamazov's Devil and nearly drives him to insanity at the end of *The Brothers Karamazov*. For the intellect can create and destroy systems of belief with fiendish agility and leave the mind face to face with nothingness; it is essentially nihilistic. It is this principle that leads Dostoevsky's characters down a blind alley of the mind, the only escape from which is insanity or suicide. It is this "Euclidian understanding," as personified in Nicolay Stavrogin of *The Possessed,* that is the most formidable barrier in the way of real understanding.

Against such "possessed" characters, Dostoevsky sets the pure of heart, men like Prince Myshkin of *The Idiot*, Aloysha Karamazov and Father Zosima. The attitude of these men is a profound and passive acceptance of the world through love, a non-resistance to evil and a consistent rejection of the fetters of desire, that, in its mystical Asiatic Christianity, is very near to Buddhism.

The Buddha laid it down in his Noble Truth of Suffering, that all the ills that man is heir to are the result of his assertion of self-will, the result of desire for gratification of the senses, and among the senses, as a thing essentially perishable, he included the mind, the personal ego. Suffering can be the only

ultimate result of such an assertion, such a desire, when the things we thirst for are in their very nature transitory and therefore, *sub speciè aeternitatis* illusory. Thus only by denial of the self-will, by transcending the mind and the renunciation of our personal ego can we ever hope to reach to that timeless omniscience, that perception of the deathlessness and changelessness of the Self realised as one with the universal soul of Nature, which is bliss, which is Nirvana. Even then it is not by mental exertion that we can reach this state, which is the end to which we were born, but by spiritual intuition that transcends the mind.

It is this state to which Dostoevsky refers in *The Possessed* in a conversation between Kirillov and Stavrogin when the former says:

> "Life exists, but death doesn't at all."
>
> "You've begun to believe in future eternal life?"
>
> "No, not in a future eternal life, but in eternal life here. There are moments, you reach moments, and time suddenly stands still and it will become eternal!"

In another place Kirillov says, stumbling with his words in the ecstasy of his intuition:—

> The feeling is unmistakable; it's as though you apprehend all nature and suddenly say, "Yes, that's right . . . . Yes, it's right, it's good . . . . It . . . It's not being deeply moved, but simply joy. You don't forgive anything because there's no need of forgiveness. It's not that you love—Oh, there's something in it higher than love . . . . What's most awful is that it's terribly dear and such joy!"

And again:

> Man is only unhappy because he doesn't know he's happy. It's only that. That's all, that's all! If any one finds out, he'll become happy at once, in a minute!

It is an inward transformation such as this that is the essence of all mystical experience: the removal of temporal illusion, the ability to see everything with the eye of eternity.

Similarly we have those moments of the highest mystical intuition which precede Prince Myshkin's epileptic fits, those Nirvanic glimpses, the memory and the anticipation of which dominates his whole life. Commenting on them, Dostoevsky, who was an epileptic himself, writes:

> That such moments really contained the highest synthesis of life he could not doubt, nor even dare to admit the possibility of doubt. . .And since, in the last conscious moment preceding the attack, he could say to himself, with full understanding of his words: "I would give my whole life for this one instant!", then doubtless to him it really was worth a life-time.

Describing such moments himself, Myshkin says:

> I feel, then, as if I understood those amazing words "There shall be no more time". . . No doubt the epileptic Mahomet refers to that same moment when he says he visited all the dwellings of Allah in less time than was needed to empty his pitcher of water.

It is not for nothing that some peoples have always regarded epileptics with awe and reverence as those who are in touch with the divine. In the utilitarian West, however, they are regarded

merely as obstacles in the way of practical activity, idiots, in fact, as all the other characters in the book regard Myshkin, till they discover that he was wiser than any of them.

All great spiritual reformers have been spurred to their task by some spiritual disorder or state of non-balance. Their teaching is simply a revelation of the means of attaining spiritual poise and wholeness. Buddha showed that poise and wholeness can only be attained by true renunciation and taught the approach to this condition through love in the sense of gentleness, unselfishness and compassion, which, by helping one to realise the Oneness of all life, destroys the fetters of ill-will and sensuality, limiting one's perception within the narrow bounds of self, and permits of self-realization through self-expansion, till finally one partakes of the Universal Life in the tranquillity of perfect knowledge.

For the intuitive reader, these principles are implicit in all Dostoevsky's work. As M. Gide points out in his admirably lucid study of the author, Dostoevsky divides the human personality into three strata: the mind, the passions and a vast realm remote from either mind or passion. It is this last realm that is inhabited by the soul and in relation to it the most tragic events, the most tempestuous passions, are no more than shadows. This indeed, in the Universal Self which knows no individuality, no separateness from the whole.

Dostoevsky's conception of the human will is essentially Buddhistic and is well illustrated in the following passage from Schopenhauer's *The World As Will and Idea*:

> The inflicter of suffering and the sufferer are one. . .If the eyes of both were opened, the inflicter would see that he lives in all that suffers pain in the wide world. . . and the sufferer would see that all the wickedness which is, or ever was, committed in this world, proceeds from that will which constitutes *his* nature also, appears also in *him*, and that through this phenomenon and its assertion he has taken upon himself all the sufferings which proceed from such a will, and bears them as his due, so long as he is this will.

This is the state of mind of Dostoevsky's most spiritual characters, of Myshkin, of Father Zosima and Aloysha Karamazov. It is Father Zosima who kneels down and kisses the ground before a great sinner and sacrilegious libertine. It is he who says:–

> Love all God's creation—every grain of sand, every leaf, every ray of God, you should love. Love animals, love plants, love everything. Love everything and you will arrive at God's secret in things.

It is the state of mind, as formulated above by Schopenhauer, in which we find Myshkin at the beginning of *The Idiot*. He is the only motiveless, unselfish and spiritually naked character in the book, and he bears the burden of the suffering World-will, transcending it in moments of purest, intuitive bliss. Myshkin, his author confessed on one occasion, was his idea of a perfect man.

It is not till we come to the *Dream of a Queer Fellow*, from the *Journal of an Author*, that we have the essence of Dostoevsky's gospel and his affinity to Buddhism set forth clearly and unmistakably in the parable of a queer fellow's vision of a replica of our own, but where all live together in an harmony of love and a mystical communion with Nature.

> They desired nothing, but were calm; they did not aspire to a knowledge of life, as we aspire to knowledge, because their life was fulfilled. But their knowledge was deeper and higher than our science, for our science seeks to explain what is life, she aspires to know life, that she may teach others how to live; but they, without science, knew how to live. . .They showed me trees, but I could not understand the depth of love with which they looked at them, exactly as though they spoke with their fellows. And perhaps I should not be wrong if I said they did speak with them. . . In the same way they regard all nature—the animals which lived at peace with them, did not attack them, but loved them, subdued by their love. They pointed out the stars to me and told me something about them that I could not understand, but I am convinced that in some way they were in contact with the stars of heaven, having connection with them not by thought alone but in some physical way.
>
> They hardly understood me when I asked them concerning eternal life, but they were evidently so convinced of it that it was no question to them. They had no temples, but they had a real, living and continual communion with the whole universe; they had no religion, but they had the firm knowledge that when their earthly joy had been consummated to the limit of their earthly nature, then would begin for them, living as well as dead, a yet greater expansion of their contact with the whole universe. They awaited this moment with joy, but with no impatience, with no anguished longing for it, but already as it were partaking of it in presentiments of their hearts which they communicated to each other.
>
> I saw and know that men could be beautiful and happy, without losing the capacity to live on earth. I will not, I cannot believe that evil is the normal condition of men.

Dostoevsky knew that love was the most expansive and emancipative of all forces, and he pictures here a state, such as the Buddha taught, of self-realisation through self-expansion.

Buddhism is the most inward conception of life, the most intrinsic standard of moral worth, that has ever been given to human thought. Just as Christianity, as taught by Christ, it is founded on the great conceptions of the Upanishads, the ultimate source of all spiritual knowledge. And the novels of Dostoevsky illustrate more powerfully than any others the Buddha's words:

> Virtue rewards itself by strengthening the will, by subduing unworthy desire, by generating knowledge of reality, by giving inward peace. Sin punishes itself by weakening the will, by inflaming unworthy desire, by generating delusions, by breeding fever and unrest.

PHILIP HENDERSON

THE EXPERIMENTAL ORIGIN OF KNOWLEDGE

[**W. Wilson Leisenring, B.A.**, is the author of *The Real Earth, Too Small for Life*, etc. and at one time was associate-editor of *World Power*.—EDS.]

I

The fundamental question with regard to H. P. Blavatsky, and the one of all others most significant to-day, is how did she obtain her knowledge? If that were known, the crucial problem of present-day science might be, at least partially, solved. Those who seriously follow, or try to follow the pronouncements of men of science realize that the leaders of research have come face to face with the mystery of the origin of knowledge and of the nature of man. Their own experiments and researches have brought them into instrumental contact with regions of the 'atom' and molecule, with fields of space and states of psychical reaction that apparently stultify the hitherto known 'laws of Nature'. A mystery vast, dark and occult looms around us, and Space refuses as yet to yield up its secrets.

There was no place for mystery in old-fashioned 'materialism,' and fifty years ago the most prominent scientific authorities wanted to be materialists: perhaps fortunately so, as otherwise the motive for scientific research might have been lacking. To-day eminent physicists invoke metaphysical conceptions to account for the finite, physical universe; distinguished biologists hypothecate individual minds to explain the behaviour of minute organisms; palæontologists glimpse a Dawn Man rising on the receding horizons of geological ages; and archæologists conclude that highly civilized man must be immeasurably old since the date of his appearance cannot be fixed and his origin is remote and illusive in the mists of antiquity.

In general and in detail H. P. Blavatsky predicted the present position of science. At the time *The Secret Doctrine* was published its scientific philosophy was not only heterodox to theological teachings, but revolutionary, if not fantastic, to scientific authorities. It is only forty years since her death and many persons who knew Madame Blavatsky are still living, including several eminent specialists whose views were discussed in *The Secret Doctrine*; but during that period all departments of science have contributed to the confirmation of her statements in regard to both facts and principles. This, alone, characterizes the production of that work, and of the earlier volumes, *Isis Unveiled*, as a unique phenomenon hitherto unknown. It is needless, for our present enquiry, to consider the many other factors, so often and inconclusively discussed, which focus around Madame Blavatsky. Both the writer and the contents of her

books have a strictly scientific interest because, if we knew how Madame Blavatsky obtained her knowledge, the key to the present dead-lock between physics and metaphysics might be found. It may be granted that she was an extra-ordinary personality, was a gifted linguist and had a wide knowledge of the world and of human character; it may be known that she spent a large part of her life in travels which took her three times round the world, and that she ventured into out-of-the-way territories amongst all kinds of tribes and races; it may also be affirmed that she possessed unusual psychical powers from childhood: but these characteristics and experiences would not of themselves, singly or collectively, have enabled her to write *The Secret Doctrine*. Neither travellers nor 'psychics' make verifiable predictions regarding the future of scientific research. In the annals of psychical research and mediumistic phenomena we find nothing new revealed by mediums. No 'spirit' has ever uttered an idea that has not been expressed often before, has ever presented a new outlook on life, or stated an unknown "law" of Nature.

H. P. Blavatsky had no training in modern scientific methods. She had never experimented in Western laboratories; and yet so appreciative was she of scientific research that a large part of her writings was devoted to scientific discussions. So certain was she of her own knowledge that in *The Secret Doctrine* she declared that

> In the twentieth century of our era scholars will begin to recognize that the *Secret Doctrine* has neither been invented nor exaggerated, but, on the contrary, simply outlined; and finally, that its teachings antedate the Vedas (I, XXXVII).
>
> No disbeliever who takes the "Secret Doctrine" for a "hoax" is forced or even asked to credit our statements ... Nor, is it after all, necessary that any one should believe in the Occult Sciences and the old teachings, before one knows anything or even believes in his own soul. No great truth was ever accepted *a priori*, and generally a century or two passed before it began to glimmer in the human consciousness as a possible verity, except such cases as the positive discovery of the thing claimed as a fact. The truths of to-day are the falsehoods and errors of yesterday, and *vice versâ*. It is only in the XXth century that portions, if not the whole, of the present work will be vindicated (II, 441-2).

Those who have noted at all carefully the results of scientific research during the last twenty years or so, and who have at the same time read and pondered Madame Blavatsky's writings, realize that this prophecy is even now well on the way to fulfilment. But the mere fact of such corroboration is not in itself important. What a scientific inquirer is interested to know is the source of her knowledge—the methods by which it was obtained, for that might give a clue to the significance of much of her exposition as yet unconfirmed experimentally, and indicate, perhaps, new directions for research.

It is obvious that the origin of human knowledge must be in man himself. Whatever has been known or will be known by him

must be potential in his own nature. It is possible, too, that, in past cycles of racial evolutions and civilization, knowledge may have been obtained by experimental means other than those employed to-day. It is now certain that there was a technical knowledge of practical sciences in ancient and prehistoric civilizations that had been forgotten in subsequent ages, although the existence of a real experimental science of psychology may not be considered so assured. Thus 'relativity' seems to apply to knowledge of scientific principles as well as to 'events' perceived by the physical senses; such knowledge being relative at any given point in the racial cycle. More than that: it must be relative to man's powers of sensational perception, and to his ability to isolate and experiment with the matter under observation. Stated in another way: consciousness itself must be relative to the frequency level of the energy with which the organism interacts; and this factor depends on (though it is not caused by) the degree of complexity and evolution the organism has attained.

Science has found that the five physical senses of man function in different frequency levels of the ether, and that they respond (consciously to man) to but a limited range of the energy-frequencies by which the organism is surrounded and interpenetrated. Scientific instruments supplement this restriction to an amazing extent, but they also have their limitations since they are constructed of terrestrial materials and elements which have not passed through the processes that have evolved the human brain. As physical matter is thus finite for us, energy or radiation above a certain frequency cannot be isolated by purely physical means. It does not follow, however, logically or evidentially, that there are no ultra-physical energies, nor that they could not be controlled by ultra-physical means, if we had access to such. In any case, we have as yet insufficient knowledge of that marvellous organism, the human brain, to state positively that it contains no organs or 'centres,' not functioning at present, which may have been active in earlier races or may be developed in a future race of mankind and in rare individuals of our present race.

The knowledge of Nature so far obtained by modern science has been *by means of experiment*; and there can be no other kind of knowledge. When men despair of finding new means of experiment they admit defeat in the search for truth. The retort may be: "True, but the physical universe is objective and external to us, and, therefore, means for experiment may be devised; and if states of energy exist within or beyond those apparent to us, how can they be experimentally demonstrated? It seems, indeed, that what may be beyond our perception must be forever unknown and that we can merely

mentally speculate about it." Some thinkers conclude, therefore, that mind or thought must be the ultra-physical state of the universe because the human mind has played the dominant part in conducting researches, and mental conceptions interpret for us the known universe.

These conceptions have been formulated and termed the Laws of Nature. The entities of Nature apparently behave like logical beings, 'obeying' these laws, until physicists discovered states of energy in which the entities do not conform to any of our previous conceptions. In other words, they appear to be a different kind of intelligence. They behave, not according to the conceptions of our logical minds, but according to our ideas of entities endowed with 'free-will'. Thus the characteristic of 'will' is added to that of 'thought' in order to describe or interpret for our finite satisfaction, states existing on the borders between the seen and the unseen. Were scientific workers able, however, to control these seemingly irrational and capricious entities their sportive freedom would be at an end, and the threatened break in the Uniformity of Nature would be averted; for they would be compelled to obey a 'law' or intelligence imposed or impressed upon them. But for all we know, those elements in Nature in ultra-physical and biological states, at present beyond scientific control, do obey the law of their own peculiar characteristics—*their* life or intelligence—and act and react within their inherent restrictions.

Scientific research has shown that each type (of 'atom,' molecule, species etc.) in Nature is bound by limitations determined by its own constitution and the concomitant environmental conditions, the medium or 'field' of its existence. Even human intelligence, which, we flatter ourselves, is 'free' must be subservient to its own characteristics, to its own 'field' of operation, the element or medium in which it functions. That only could be 'free' which is independent of, unmotived and uncaused by any exterior conditions whatever whether apparent to us, or not.

Hence it is evident that exteriority or objectivity is a relative matter. Impulses which we imagine are subjective and free may be impelled by influences exterior *to them* though unseen and subjective with reference to our physical perceptions. We cannot control or determine the nature of such impulses (whether physical or mental energy) until we externalize them; and we cannot accomplish this objectification while our consciousness is focused through our organism in the same energy-level as that in which those impulses operate. It is because man's brain functions in mental levels of the ether superior to the range of the purely animal instincts that he is able to re-organize his physical environment and control the lower energies of Nature. He

has the power to project or objectify his thoughts.

Every advance in scientific knowledge has been achieved by making external or objective what was previously hidden from the senses or conceived of only in thought, subjectively. As an experimentalist advances in knowledge he must continue to objectify. At that point or energy-level where he finds himself incapable of doing this, his knowledge must cease.

It has been suggested that the reason it is impossible to objectify ultra-physical constituents of light is because they consist merely of thought: they are, in fact, nothing but mathematical formulae which are materialized in mechanical systems of electromagnetic energies. If this be the case intellectual man has come face to face with himself in the glass of Nature in which he truly sees but darkly. Are we, then, entitled to assert that Nature and Man are actually one and the same? If we accept this conclusion we virtually deny the principle of evolution and imply that present-day scientific geniuses represent the *ne plus ultra* of knowledge and human achievement—that man has no future. Nature merely reflects our Psyche. But, surely, this Psyche is as illusive as in the ancient myths, and man is apparently still unable to capture her. Is the significance of this *impasse* that man must direct his researches on himself if he would penetrate deeper into Nature and understand and control his Psyche mirrored in its depths? Or must we conclude that such experimental research is impossible, and that the present civilized man represents the highest type that evolution can produce?

W. WILSON LEISENRING

An occultist can produce phenomena, but he cannot supply the world with brains, nor with the intelligence and good faith necessary to understand and appreciate them.

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Raja-Yoga or Occultism*, p. 49

SOME SPIRITUAL NOTES IN MODERN VERSE

[**Vida D. Scudder** was born in India, educated in Europe and taught in America. She is the author of numerous volumes among them "The Life of the Spirit in the Modern English Poets" (1895). In sending the article she wrote—"I confess that I am not at all sure that the article will please you, for I suspect that your point of view is not quite mine". While we regret this, we are sure our readers will not fail to note the beauty of her writing and enjoy it as we have done.—EDS.]

A sensitive mind exposed to modern verse or novels may feel a little sad. Chaotic incertitudes often greet us. Now we encounter sensuous passion, recorded, save the mark! with the defiant air of new discovery; now a strained plunge into the depths of consciousness drags from the mud of the sub-conscious a tangled mess of amorphous emotions and ideas, to fling on the printed page. Old traditions of lovely form,—rhyme, rhythm, organization,—are tossed to the winds; and the result frequently baffles understanding. A good deal of poetry simply bewilders the reader, who desperately chases pronouns without antecedents down the queerly printed page, and rejoices, at the victorious moment when the meaning is caught, in much the type of satisfaction afforded by the conquest of a picture puzzle.

Modern poetry is not only often cryptic; it is drearily disillusioned. An American writer,—he happens to be a novelist,—some time ago said that all his books amounted to showing how dull life is. And indeed fleshly experience plus escape from inhibitions never succeeded in making life interesting for more than a little while.

Not all modern poetry keeps us however, if a Victorian allusion may be permitted, "on a darkling plain where ignorant armies clash by night". We cannot, by the way, claim pre-eminence in disillusion; it was as easy for Matthew Arnold to look at things that way as it is for T. S. Eliot to regard life as a Waste Land under a curse. For that matter, Macbeth found the last word in this line when he called life "a tale told by an idiot". Yet always, and to-day is no exception, some poetry takes us away from the darkling plain to sunlit reaches, visited by rays from the light that never was on sea or land.

The distinctive quality of an age is often best seen in its secondary poets; as in the seventeenth century, when men like Trahern and Vaughan certainly reveal the deeper intuitions of the time better than the icy splendours of Milton. Our day is rich in minor poets, and the reader of their slim volumes is ever and again surprised by a lovely flash from the Far Country of the soul. The air, so silent to our stupid ears, is always full of music that the radio can transmit; and poetry has great transmitting power. Francis Thompson caught the

grand rhythm of the speed of the Pursuing and Fleeing God. In the verse of some Irish poets, the veils of sense are as thin as the mists over their hills as in Yeats, with his messages from faery, or Æ, whose songs, to use his own words, are "half from the hidden world and half from this". Nor is magic confined to Ireland. Housman, especially in his "Little Plays of St. Francis" can lead us into the presence of the God-possessed. Evelyn Underhill, Masefield, Alfred Noyes, yes, the Sitwells, Humbert Wolfe, can induct us into reality now and then. Alice Meynell writing with such subtle restraint that the listener must be very still, shared with us an intimate knowledge:

" 'You never attained to Him'. 'If to attain
Be to abide, then that may be'.
'Endless the way, with how much pain !'
'The Way was He.' "

Turning to the United States, names crowd the memory of fine spirits each with a special report, of the Beyond: Emily Dickenson, Father Tabb, William Vaughan Moody, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Anna Hempstend Branch.

Let us dwell a little on one poet, whom those who would live in the Spirit may value more in fifty years than she is valued now. In the life as in verse of Eva Gore-Booth is the rare essential union of social passion and mystical insight. Sister of Countess Markievicz of the Sinn Feinn Movement, our poet herself rejected violence in any form, though her sympathy was intense for the "land of falling tears and broken promises," and for those who suffered for that land. Her own devotion went out first to work for the emancipation of women and this led her to contact with modern industrial evils and the horror of them and of war. Passionate pity is the key note of her social attitude; it has perhaps most perfect expression in her drama or Maeve of the Battles, where Fionavar, daughter of Maeve dies through anguish over those slain in her mother's wars. The poignancy of our poet's cry against the injustices that ravage us will be felt by all who read " Womens' Trades on the Embankment " or " The Good Samaritan". But she knows that social ends can be compassed in the long run only by spiritual force, and writes "To Certain Reformers":

So long as the senses reign
And the spirit is trodden down
Your desire ye shall not gain,
Ye shall not win your crown.

It is not in her social poems that she moves most freely, but when she can hear "The Little Waves of Breffny," or when in the presence of beauty seen a higher beauty gleams. For always she is aware of Him

"Whom Christ hath called Love,
Strange Father of the Inner Life that flows
Deep down beneath the colour of the rose."

In the purest strain of that intuitive philosophy born of experience she rises from the Many to the One. She writes of the sunlit cloud; and suddenly:

"The Eternal Beauty leans toward my soul,
Till life and love are merged in one great
shining whole."

She echoes Keats as she cries, "I have sought the Hidden Beauty

in all things". Never was any one more sensitive to loveliness; to the blue of the gentian, the primrose gold, the far shining of Alpine snows, the art of Italy. Wide travel, familiarity with literatures of many lands, furnish her themes and impart dim fragrance to her verse. But it is not only through nature, art or letters, that the Eternal Beauty shines for her. Her spiritual pilgrimage guided her to great enlightenment.

Eva Gore-Booth is capable of sad irony, as in the penetrating lines, " The World's Grief "; but she climbs through the zone of pain and cloud into the upper air. Three dominant influences may be noted in her work. In the writing of no other Irish poet is truer rendering of that exquisite Celtic spirit which wavers forever in the borderland between the seen and the Unseen. She bends the magical old myths to the service of her modern faith. Next comes the influx of perception from the East. Scholarship discerns more and more the close connection of old Ireland with the Orient; the work of Eva Gore-Booth bears the imprint of earnest Oriental studies. The sense of the Indwelling God was native to her, but it is now enhanced. Definite stress on Reincarnation inspires several poems full of grave beauty, as the lines "To C.A" (Lady Clare Annesley), the wholly delightful "Vagrant's Romance", or, more subtly and with more general connotation, "The Immortal Soul".

But, as in Emerson's "Brahma" and in most theosophical writings in English, the ancient wisdom has passed through a modern and Western mind. She derived much from the high visions of the East, but her pilgrim soul did not pause there. Repudiating no insight she had gained, she was gently led into the sanctuary, for her, of Christian faith. Nothing was lost, one repeats, of earlier gifts, when there came to her an awareness of the everlasting truth in the great Christian mysteries. Nor were these mysteries mere symbols to her but revelation of reality, as ultimate as dim mortal eyes may see. They meant to her recognition of the Transcendent God, of a great redemption from without the separate soul, surrounding the helplessness of human life. In those later collections inspired by Christianity, "The House of Three Windows" and "The Shepherd of Eternity," the poems grow in clarity and force. Her study at this time was concentrated on the Fourth Gospel, which is, not excepting the *Bhagavad-Gita*, the greatest gift mystical faith has ever received; and various poems derived from "Johns'" narrative show not only tender and awe-struck imagination, but rare interpretive power. But whether her themes are drawn from Greek myth, from Oriental wisdom, or from Christian doctrine, the control is ever the same: the vision of the Eternal Beauty, quickening consecration to a world where women shall have come to their own, where industrial cruelties shall be no more, where wars

shall cease, and men in sacred freedom shall have achieved the unity of love fulfilled.

Many poets beside those mentioned above share her burning intuition of Deity. They write with refreshing diversity of accent, but they have one witness to bear. These moderns when they touch religion at all, have sometimes a singular gift of conveying reassurance. Even a secular epic like Benet's "John Brown's Body" holds as solemn recognition as Hardy's "Dynasts" of the mighty Immanent Will. Even a brilliant piece of sardonic irony like Humbert Wolfe's "News of the Devil" is imbued with extraordinary apprehension of the Unescapable God; and in his "Requiem" the same faith shines through the studies in defeat and shame. So through our turbulent confusion sounds the Divine Summons, and at any moment the compelling accents of the Spirit may be heard in the very voices that deny.

VIDA D. SCUDDER

As the eye of the expert jeweller discerns under the rough and uncouth oyster shell the pure immaculate pearl, enshrined within its bosom, his hand dealing with the former but to get at its contents, so the eye of the true philosopher reads between the lines of the Purânas the sublime Vedic truths, and corrects the form with the help of the Vedantic wisdom. Our Orientalists, however, never perceive the pearl under the thick coating of the shell, and—act accordingly.

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. II, p. 528

What we desire to prove is, that underlying every ancient popular religion was the same ancient wisdom-doctrine, one and identical, professed and practised by the initiates of every country, who alone were aware of its existence and importance. To ascertain its origin, and the precise age in which it was matured, is now beyond human possibility. A single glance, however, is enough to assure one that it could not have attained the marvellous perfection in which we find it pictured to us in the relics of the various esoteric systems, except after a succession of ages. A philosophy so profound, a moral code so ennobling, and practical results so conclusive and so uniformly demonstrable is not the growth of a generation, or even a single epoch. Fact must have been piled upon fact, deduction upon deduction, science have begotten science, and myriads of the brightest human intellects have reflected upon the laws of nature, before this ancient doctrine had taken concrete shape.

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, 99

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RELIGIONS

[**Professor D. S. Sarma** writes with lucidity and vigour on the subject of the study of different religious creeds. There is no other force so powerful in uniting the different races into one family than the energy of Wisdom enshrined in Religion ; conversely, there is no other force so destructive of human solidarity as the separative tendencies inherent in every organized religion. "The chief cause of nearly two-thirds of the evils that pursue humanity, ever since that cause became a power is religion under whatever form and in whatever nation—the religion of the sacerdotal caste, of the priesthood, and of the churches. Ignorance created gods and cunning took advantage of opportunity. The sum of human misery will never be diminished unto that day when the better portion of humanity destroys in the name of Truth, Morality, and Universal Charity the altars of these false gods." Thus wrote a great Indian Sage. The different religions inculcate the propitiation of half-gods; dethrone them and Gods arrive who promulgate RELIGION by which man lives and labours in knowledge. The plea of Professor Sarma is a Theosophical one : the mystic element in each religion enthrones self-effort to emancipation and enlightenment and rejects the intermediary, the priest, between man and deity, these two being but different aspects of the One Life. Attention is drawn to two extracts on the preceding page.—EDS.]

Here are two books* before us which seek to appraise some of the great religions of the world.

The first is an honest attempt to describe the essentials of almost all religions ancient and modern.

The second is only an indirect attempt to discredit the peoples of India in the eyes of other nations, and may be dismissed at once without any further comment.

The former raises the interesting question of the value and importance of the comparative study of religions. In recent years many books have been written on this subject. The general reader in Europe and America nowadays wants to know something about the great historical religions, if only to congratulate himself on the possession of a faith which is so manifestly superior to all other religions. The demand is met by enterprising publishers who employ an author or a group of authors, some of whom may be specialists, for the work. The authors thus called upon to describe all the religions under the sun forthwith begin to read the available handbooks and supplement the information given in them by spicy or picturesque details offered by travellers or missionaries or interested journalists. The result is perhaps a charming book which will delude the reader into great self-complacency and semblance of culture. Meanwhile the poor Hindus,

1. *Procession of the Gods*. By G. G. ATKINS. (Constable & Co., London. 15*s*.)
2. *The Religions and Hidden Cults of India*. By Sir GEORGE MACMUNN. (Sampson Low, Marston & Co., London. 15*s*.)

Buddhists and Muhammadans whose religions are caricatured can only smile at the amazing ignorance and arrogance of the Western writers. To exaggerate some of the ugly features of Eastern religions, to confuse their essentials with their excrescences, to persist in looking at the roots of their institutions and not at the fruits, and above all to judge Christianity alone by its ideals and all other religions by their practices—this is not the way to arrive at truth in religion or to find out what religion has done for man in various countries of the world. But generally this has been the way followed by many occidental writers who pretend to make a comparative study of religions.

A better and a more hopeful way—the true Aryan path—is that of the students of mysticism. From the records of the inner lives of the saints and mystics of all religions we are able to see that there is a common path of light which all have trodden. It seems to lie like a steel frame behind all types of religious structures. The skeleton is the same, the flesh covering it varies in texture and the skin above the flesh varies in colour. If all religions are examined according to the light they throw on the various stages of the mystic way and grouped accordingly, we shall not only arrive at the right principle of their classification but shall also be in a position to see their relative merits and, what is most important, their inner unity.

The mystic way—"the flight of the Alone to the Alone"—has, as every student of mysticism knows, some more or less definitely marked stages. It begins with a great unrest of the soul which leads to the awakening, technically called Conversion. After the awakening the soul passes through a period of self-discipline and purification to the stage of Illumination in which it is able to live for a much longer time in the higher states of consciousness. After that it passes through the many trials incidental to contemplative life and reaches the Unitive stage in which it lives in union with the Great Self and is able to reconcile within itself profound peace and incessant activity. These are the well-known traditional stages of the inner way traversed by all mystics.

Now, if we take the mystic path as our guiding line in examining the religions of the world, we first come across the primitive religions, in which there is a vague sense of the Divine Spirit all around but no sense of any moral or spiritual values. Fetishism and totemism, animism and ancestor-worship, all belong to the pre-awakening period. They belong to the childhood of the race and are still practised by tribes which have not outgrown their spiritual infancy.

After the awakening we have the long process of purification in which the emerging ethical values are carefully conserved. Here might therefore be grouped all the religions in which a code of ethics

is all in all—Taoism, Southern Buddhism, Jainism, etc. Other religions also have their ethics but they subordinate it to their faith in Deity. In the matter of ethics all religions are practically unanimous. Virtues are the same in every religion. Only the emphasis is different. If Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism emphasize the virtues of detachment, self-control and non-violence, Christianity emphasizes humility, service and love, Zoroastrianism emphasises purity and charity, and Islam emphasises equality and brotherhood. Each religion has its own commands and cardinal virtues, but that does not mean that the other aspects of moral life are ignored. On the other hand, we find that all virtues are brought under a few headings known as cardinal virtues. Thus with regard to ethics there is unity underlying all religions, though the distribution of emphasis confers an individuality on them.

Now passing from the purificatory stage to the illuminative stage we see that a number of theistical religions belong here—Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Northern Buddhism, Vaishnavism, Saivism, Christianity and Islam. All of them recognise a source of light and life and help to establish an emotional relation between that and the striving soul. But each of them visualises the source in its own way. Each regards it as a Personality whose attributes are revealed to the loving hearts of the worshippers either independently or through the medium of a prophet, saviour, Avatar or Bodhisattva. Men's devotions and their counterpart, the grace of God, are fundamental to this group. But the difference lies in name and form. Just as in the earlier stage we have seen ethical religions derive their individuality from the distribution of emphasis, so here we have to recognise that theistical religions derive their individuality from the name and form with which they seek to invest the Formless and the Nameless. Traditional concepts regarding the attributes of God, often made concrete by means of symbols, play a great part in fixing the form of the Deity in the minds of the followers of theistical religions.

Finally, passing from the illuminative stage and escaping the many pitfalls incidental to contemplative life, the mystic reaches the unitive stage where God is no longer an object of devotion but an inward light. Here belong the higher and the mystical phases of all great religions—Vedanta, Mahayana Buddhism, Christian Mysticism, Sufism, etc. It is a question of experience here as it was a question of emphasis and form in the first two stages. Some types of mystical religions represent the relation between the soul of man and the spirit of God as one of proximity, some as of resemblance, and some as of identity. And it is mainly from this representation that they derive their individuality. But all the other features of the uni-

tive stage are common to them—a sense of profound peace, of complete spiritual freedom and of irrefutable authority.

Thus the mystic way is our surest guide in our examination of all historical religions. Obviously that religion is the best which gives us help of the best kind in all the stages of our spiritual journey according to the growing needs of our souls. All the great religions of the world have their own accents of moral life, their own forms of worship and their own mystical doctrines which give them their individuality. Some are strong in a few particulars and weak in others. A perfect and impeccable religion is only an ideal like a perfect language. For religions and languages are not produced *in vacuo*. They are organic growths in which the evolving spirit utilises, according to the needs of the moment, the physical, psychological and historical materials that it finds in its surroundings. Therefore the task of one who wants to make a comparative study of religions is similar to that of one who makes a comparative study of languages. What do we think of an English philologist who in his admiration for the growth and structure of his own language, for its wonderful flexibility, its simplicity of grammar and its machinery of word-order pronounces Greek and Latin as clumsy, antiquated and barbarous? What do we think of his logic when he argues that the virtues which gleam only fitfully in the classical languages shine with full effulgence in modern English? But what we regard as ridiculous in the field of comparative philology we have not yet learnt to regard as ridiculous in the field of comparative religion. How many books are there written by Christian scholars who scoff at Hinduism, Buddhism and Islam because they are not like Christianity! And how many zealous missionaries are there who argue with a singular lack of humour that Christianity is the crown of Hinduism, or Buddhism or Islam!

Meanwhile the duty of those who study religions other than their own, not in a spirit of superciliousness but of reverence, not with a view to supplant them but to supplement their own, is clear. We want light and guidance at every point of our spiritual journey from "conversion" to "deification". And if the scriptures of a so-called alien religion give us greater light and better guidance at one point than those of our own religion, we should reverently utilise them and assimilate their teaching. If a Hindu, for instance, feels that in some things the New Testament gives him better guidance than the *Bhagavad-Gita* in leading a spiritual life, he should thankfully accept the teaching. Similarly if a Christian feels that in some respects the Upanishads give a clearer interpretation of his religious exeperience and provide him with a loftier conception of God than the New Testament, he should thankfully accept the help. In the kingdom of Spirit there is no question of "mine" and "thine"! Is there a question of "mine" and "thine" in the utilization of scientific discoveries? Do we not use the steam-engine, the motor car, the telephone, and the wireless irrespective of the nationality of the inventors? Mystics, saints and prophets are after all only scientists who explore the laws of the spiritual universe, make experiments in the laboratory of their souls and invent devices for the speedier march of the human spirit on the highways of the Lord. So to whatever age or nationality they belong their teachings are among humanity's permanent possessions and have to be thankfully accepted and assimilated by all. It is a mistake to look upon the immortal scriptures of other religions than our own as only interesting curios. Even a mere intellectual appreciation of them is not enough. Their practical value in applied religion has to be sought and sought assiduously. Just as we utilise all modern inventions and discoveries without a thought of their origins, so should we use the world-scriptures irrespective of their origins for the enriching of our spiritual life from day to day. Very little is gained by a mere academic study, for instance, of all the books in the 'Sacred Books of the East' series or the 'Wisdom of the East' series, and less by a superficial reading of modern compilations giving information about all the religions under the sun, and least of all by the irreligious and ignorant denunciations of other religions than one's own because they belong to a different type.

D. S. SARMA

Ideals of Hinduism. By KASHI NATH. (D. B. Taraporevala Sons & Co., Bombay. Rs. 4.)

On the whole this is an interesting and thoughtful survey despite many hasty and often contradictory statements. The author deals with the evolution of Hinduism and beginning from Rigvedic times traces the course of Hindu society upto the present crisis when "a new ferment has started within Hinduism itself which is more potent for the destruction of Hindu religion than any it has faced so far". Till now religious influence predominated in the lives of the people, and time after time in its concept of the Divine and in the ideas of its Gods, Hinduism asserted its greatness, and its Wisdom.

Self-aggrandisement is rapidly increasing, and women copy men in this as in the blind imitation of the West. In these the author sees the irrevocable doom of Hinduism: "A sudden overwhelming flood when things believed to be firm as mountains are found gone in the course of a night; and what has taken its place. . . . . nothing whatever." "No man or nation ever grew to greatness solely by copying others," but by strength of character. Spiritual education is India's crying need; renunciation not of the world, but of the heart, her way to greatness and glory. That alone, states the author, can save India.

N. K.

The Co-operative Movement in India. By ELEANOR M. HOUGH, Ph. D. (P.S. King & Son, Ltd., London. 15*s.*)

The most alarming problem of the present-day India is the poverty of its masses. The annual average income of the Indians *per capita* has been calculated as Rs. 57, and in the jail administration annual food expense of prisoners per head is taken to be Rs. 90. This very fact glaringly indicates how the Indians live a life of actual starvation. In fact, more than two-thirds of the vast population of India live in a chronic state of famine. To talk to them of higher things or ideals of life is nothing short of a grim tragedy.

To effect a lasting improvement in the condition of the 90% of Indian population that live in the villages, nothing can be more useful than the Co-operative Movement. It may not be a panacea for all the ills of life of our rural population but it has potentiality. Co-operative Movement does not mean only the starting of Co-operative Credit Societies, as is wrongly supposed by many; it can be turned into a potent factor of rural reconstruction in many important aspects. Co-operative Movement is not an economic organization only; it is "the village *panchayat* modernised in a sense, functioning as a council of elders, arranging for finance, purchase, and sale, as also for sanitation, medical relief, cattle insurance, life insurance, social reform, and not merely in theory but in actual practice carrying out a policy of rural reconstruction". The greatly useful *panchayat* system in our rural areas has broken; it is doubtful whether we can get it back. But the Co-operative Movement may be a substitute for that to a great extent.

In order to succeed it must be a spontaneous movement *of the people.* The Co-operative Movement has not made much headway in India chiefly because it has beeen sponsored by the Government, and the Government officials working it find it difficult to show or fail to prove that their interest is identical with that of the people. Therefore the Movement is not even now receiving as much sympathy from the general populace as it should. This can be remedied through the education of public opinion.

The present volume, giving details of the working of the Co-operative Movement in India—its origin and growth, its weaknesses and possibilities—will be of invaluable help to all who want to work in that field. The writer, though a foreigner, seems to have spared no pains to make a thorough study of the subject and she has been eminently successful. She has consulted innumerable authorities on the subject and not being content with mere book-knowledge has discussed the matter with many persons who have direct and personal experiences of the Movement. In fact, we are astonished to see the amount of labour she has bestowed in writing the book. And above all, she has that outlook of sympathy which is necessary for understanding properly a foreign country and its people.

It would be a disservice to the Indian to cause him to substitute for his ideal of contentment with little, the common Western concept of happiness as dependent on the satisfaction of an increasing number of wants, but there can be no objection to arousing such legitimate desires as those, for example, for the condition indispensable for health and a modicum of comfort.

No thinking person with India's good at heart would wish her to surrender her spiritual heritage in exchange for the civilization of the West in its totality, but, just as the West has much to learn from India of philosophy and spiritual attitude towards life, so India stands in need of the best the West has achieved in the conquest of physical nature. India's task is to discover the middle ground between spurning material comfort and prosperity and regarding them as ends in themselves. If she can find the way to prosperity without ceasing to regard material things as, at best, but means to the end of a deeper and fuller life, the background against which is enacted the perennial drama of soul evolution, she will have laid the world under an incalculable debt.

It is so true!

The book contains a valuable foreword and an Introduction from two authoritative writers.

PAVITRANANDA

Illustrated Magic. By OTTAKER FISCHER. With Introduction by FULTON OURSLER. Translated and edited by J.B. MUSSEY and FULTON OURSLER. (The Macmillan Co., New York. 25*s.*)

For the student of Theosophy the interest of this work is not to be found in any light which it is able to throw on esoteric science, but rather in the presentation of the views of the practitioners of the "ancient and honourable art of humbuggery" upon those occult phenomena of which the efforts of the modern conjurer are more or less plausible imitations. Within its covers the mysteries of scores of the tricks which form the stock-in-trade of the professional entertainer are disclosed.

It is rather amusing, in these days, when telepathy is coming to be recognised as an established fact not only by psychical researchers, but by scientists generally, to find the author reluctant even to admit the possibility of the genuineness of the phenomenon. "There have been so many failures . . . as to justify the suspicion that the successes were merely lucky coincidence." It may be readily conceded however, that for the purposes of public entertainment a secret and elaborate code on the lines of that given in the present volume is absolutely essential.

Some of the "explanations" offered are far more ingenious than convincing. One way to read the contents of a sealed envelope is secretly to rub the surface with a small sponge dipped in alcohol! *Odourless* alcohol?

The carrying out accurately of actions mentally commanded by another can be done, it is stated, by "*anyone* who is capable of grasping the motile impulses of the guide" or willer. It is all so simple!

Coming to the achievements of the Indian fakirs and kindred wonder-workers, the author is driven to the admission that "think what we will of the supernormal performances of the fakirs one thing we cannot doubt; the fakirs have an extensive knowledge of hypnotism and suggestion, and of this knowledge they make conscious and unlimited use. Many reports borne out by photographs have given undeniable indications of this; observers claim to have seen occurrences which did not later appear on films exposed at the time."

Accepting the statement that the fakirs and yogis make "unlimited use" of a deep and extensive knowledge of hypnotic science it is a matter of surprise to find the *mango trick* dismissed as "an insignificant affair" based on the art of palming. Still more incredible is the story which is related in regard to the performance of an Egyptian variation of this illusion. The fakir, it is said, "used little trees with hollowed-out branches. In the cavities, invisible to the spectators, were leaf-grasshoppers, whose wings looked almost exactly like tree-leaves. The fakir first showed the 'tree' bare; on command, it became covered with leaves. The trick was that he caused the grasshoppers to leave their hiding places, whereupon, sitting quiet on the twigs, they looked precisely like leaves." The secret whereby the grasshoppers are "caused to leave their hiding places" on command is not disclosed!

The endeavour is also made to fit a mechanical explanation to the "almost mythical rope trick," one of the illusions which lend themselves most readily to explanation along the lines of mass suggestion. It is not necessary to stress the fact that India is the home of occult science. The West has yet to discover the tremendous power latent in a trained will harnessed with a vivid imagination. The rope trick, according to Madame Blavatsky, is without doubt an exhibition of collective hallucination. "Who doubts," she says in *Isis Unveiled*, "but that it is an illusion or *maya*. . . .? But when such an illusion can be forced on, say, ten thousand people at the same time, as we have seen it performed during a public festival, surely the means by which such an astounding hallucination can be produced merits the attention of science".

H. P. B. also testifies to the genuineness of the phenomenon occasionally

exhibited of burial alive for a lengthy period. Witnesses of unimpeachable integrity are cited, amongst them Captain Osborne, author of *Camp and Court of Ranjit Singh* who tells how a fakir was buried alive for six weeks in a box placed in a cell three feet underground. In order to prevent deception, sentries, relieved every two hours, were detailed to stand guard night and day. When the body was resuscitated, "I called to a medical gentleman," says Captain Osborne, "and he could discover no pulsation in the heart, the temples, or the arm. There was, however a heat about the region of the brain which no other part of the body exhibited". Among the preparations for burial may be mentioned the swallowing of the tongue which, a fakir told H. P. B., "was done not only to prevent the action of the air upon the organic tissues, but also to guard against the deposit of the germs of decay . . . "

Again the phenomenon received scant credence from the conjurer, the author declaring that "deliberate deception was found in several instances. Often the fakirs were buried near hollow trees, from which tunnels led to the buried persons, so that the air supply was unhindered". To compare the voluntary suspension of animation by an application of the hidden laws of nature, with the admittedly daring and clever efforts of Houdini to imitate them, is nevertheless to degrade the "ancient and honourable" title of "magician". Magic, now synonymous with mere trickery, is, as Madame Blavatsky declares, as old as man, and, to quote *Isis Unveiled* (Vol. I, p. 25) once more, formerly "was considered a divine science, which led to a participation in the attributes of divinity itself".

HARRY J. STRUTTON

The Mind of Leonardo da Vinci. By EDWARD MCCURDY. (Jonathan Cape, London. 4*s.* 6*d.*)

Leonardo da Vinci. By CLIFFORD BAX. (Peter Davies, London. 5*s.*)

Francis I, King of France, was perhaps a bad man, as the local parson estimates morality; but he was undeniably a clever one. He said of Leonardo, who adorned his court, that he was sure there had never come into the world a man who knew so much. Leonardo's portraits, at Windsor and Turin, make one feel that saying might be true—and in far greater measure than the king, with even his limited culture, could imagine. Especially the Turin drawing shows a face as it were of Wisdom here incarnate.

Mr. Edward McCurdy, in his admirable book, sighs for some Pisgah where should stand revealed "the alp-like statue of the man whose measure of universality in mental gifts has no equal". Lacking a Pisgah, we can at least get him and Mr. Clifford Bax to lead us near the promised land. Hoisting us on their shoulders, they can give us a glimpse of this Master of humanity in human form. The paintings, drawings, and, above all, the manuscripts of Leonardo are by no means easily accessible; in these hurrying days, how shall we be too grateful to men whose intellect and industry have brought us such a view?

Mr. McCurdy claims for Leonardo that he took all knowledge as his province; but, as he says, we can only examine a few facets of the beryl. At least we have the *manuscripts*, in the thousands of pages of which "he has left the mirror of his thoughts".

Leonardo was the man of whom a contemporary said: "in his appearance there was such radiance of beauty that the sight of him made sorrowful hearts glad". He was at once a painter, sculptor, architect, musician, engineer, anatomist, geographer, botanist, astronomer, geologist, chemist, mathematician: and, let us add, philosopher. In each domain of study he distinguished himself —in some he was pre-eminent. The wonder-man of his age, he has baffled the enquiring spirits of posterity as no other man has done. What was his

secret?

Mr. McCurdy leaves us to guess that for ourselves—without reminding us, like Mr. Bax, that "all Leonardists in the end go mad". He treats Leonardo's life as a kind of obstacle race: points out the size and height of the various hurdles one by one, repeating constantly that only a super-man could have cleared them at all but that Leonardo did so with ease—and in incredible numbers. He does his work efficiently, but the *why* and *wherefore* he leaves alone.

Mr. Bax, on the other hand, not deterred by the threat of lunacy, skims lightly over the obstacles and settles down to reconsider the race as a whole. *Why* did Leonardo run it? What were his motives and whence his great success?

Mr. Bax is notoriously light on his spiritual feet; he follows his hero nimbly through a maze of ingenious suggestions, coming out the other side with a theory plausible enough to receive our serious attention. It would be unfair to reveal it here. But we would venture to suggest that the secret of Leonardo's life is more likely to unfold itself to the eye of a mystic than to that of an art-critic or psycho-analyst. Mr. Bax is his old brilliant self in this delightful essay, but he is at heart a mystic of no mean order; we are inclined to think he could have taken us deeper than he does.

Leonardo was a great humanitarian. He refused to make public a method which he discovered for remaining a long time under water, "because of the evil nature of man who would use it for assassinations under the sea". He condemned all war as a "bestial passion". He was essentially a man of the Spirit; coarseness and brutalities of the material plane bruised and hurt his fastidious mind. The horror of inflicting pain was such as to lead him to be a vegetarian, is to be inferred from a reference which occurs in a letter sent by Andrea Corsali to Giuliano de' Medici, in which, after telling him of an Indian race called Gujerats who neither eat anything that contains blood nor permit any injury to any living creature, he adds *like our Leonardo da Vinci.*

On one occasion, Leonardo apostrophises, in his most solemn terms, the mankind which all around him he saw at war:—

> And thou, man, who by these my labours dost look upon the marvellous works of nature, if thou judgest it to be an atrocious act to destroy the same, reflect that it is an infinitely atrocious act to take away the life of man. For thou shouldst be mindful that though what is thus compounded seem to thee of marvellous subtlety, it is as nothing compared with the soul that dwells within this structure; and in truth, whatever this may be, it is a divine thing which suffers it thus to dwell within its handiwork at its good pleasure, and wills not that thy rage or malice should destroy such a life, since he, in truth, who values it not, does not deserve it.

Orthodox religion, in any form, he abominated, as representing the causes of humbug and sham. His MSS. are written in looking-glass script with the left-hand—to be unreadable to those not in the secret. He feared a charge of heresy from the clerics if his views were known—with the then consequent results of torture and death. No doubt his vast scientific knowledge led to unorthodox views; but, no doubt also, he was confirmed in them by his reading of Eastern works, *the books of Avicenna* among others. And there is reason to believe that he himself visited the East as a young man.

The world, according to Mr. Bax, is too old now for its childish joy in poetry and art. Our friends—most of them—are too old in mind. They are too far in advance of the poetic phase in human development. Poetry is too simple to satisfy their puzzle-loving mentality. It may be so. But the Kingdom of Heaven is for little children—and some there are in this age who are "born again" to that estate. They would be well content to meet the great Leonardo striding through Renascence Italy, his splendid form wrapped in his pink cloak, his golden hair glittering in the sun, his eyes fixed on Eternity. What would they not give to watch the painting of *The Last Supper* or his unearthly *Virgin of the Rocks*: pictures which

no artist has excelled before or since—and to hear his voice ring out over his silver lute or let fall words of wisdom and prophecy that to this day enrich the world? Perhaps someday the opportunity will come. Mr. Bax quotes Socrates most aptly in bidding him adieu:—

> Never fear that a soul which has been thus nurtured, and has had these pursuits, will at her departure from the body be scattered and blown away by the winds and be nowhere and nothing.

R. A. L. ARMSTRONG

The Cross and Indian Thought. By V. CHAKKARAI, B.A., B.L. (Christian Literature Society for India. Madras. Re. 1/4.)

The book expounds the central teaching of Christianity about the Cross in the light of Indian religious thought so as to make its meaning and value clear to the modern mind in India. The author feels that not only a work of the type of Bishop Butler's *Analogy of Religion* should be produced which would serve the same unique purpose for the Indian Church as did Butler's for the Western Church in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in its religious life, but that the present situation in India further demands a more radical restatement of Christianity, and by writing this treatise he modestly claims to have only paved the way for such reconstruction in future.

The book has been a further addition to the stock of Christian religious literature of the orthodox type. Jesus, is represented in the usual orthodox way as *the* Avatar, *the* Redeemer, the Manifestation of God to work out the salvation of mankind. He is not to be taken as the efflorescence of the world-movement, or as the product of *Karma*. The author seems to have misinterpreted the doctrine of *Karma* or the eternal law of cause and effect. His endeavour in this treatise has been rather in a subtle way to show the superiority of Christianity. But such a claim, like that of any other creed-follower, fails to serve its purpose. The figure of Jesus has no greater attraction than that of any other Avatar nor is organised Christianity free of faults any more than other organised religions. The book, nevertheless, contains a clear and lucid exposition of the author's viewpoint and should have a special appeal to those who share his religious convictions.

J. K. M.

The Lady of the Boat. By LADY MURASAKI. The Fifth Part of *The Tale of Genji.* Translated by ARTHUR WALEY. (Allen and Unwin. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Arthur Waley is nearing the completion of his translation of the *Genji Monogatari*, by Lady Murasaki, and the publication of the sixth volume will see the end of a task of rendering into English a Japanese work of fifty-four books, comprising 4234 pages, and the close study of Motoori's nine-volume commentary, the *Tama no Ogushi*. The difficulties of rendering obsolete Japanese into the English language without losing the curious fragrance of the original text is an achievement beyond praise. Mr. Arthur Waley has succeeded so well that he must rank with the few great translators of Eastern literature. Not the opulence of the *Arabian Nights*, the pessimism of Omar Khayyam, the sensuousness of Hafiz, the asceticism of Chomei, but a glowing beauty that reflected the life of the Japanese Court at Kyoto during part of the Heian period. In this work we find close and intimate observation of human character: the scented and polished surface of exquisite refinement and the deeper places of the heart. Like jewels threaded across the pages we delight to discover poems in praise of blossom, snow, moon, dew, mountains: a lover's message distilled into a brief and elegant verse. The love of life is here, and it is sheltered, urbane,

aesthetic: life gently modulated as if it held no more than a spray of flowers or autumn leaves, a gracious song played at the right moment by a cultured musician. It was life that seemed composed of colour and perfume and refined accomplishments when in England, with Canute for king, we were little better than barbarians.

If we must classify the *Genji Monogatari* as a romance primarily concerned with the many love affairs of Prince Genji, it is beneath the surface, much more than a series of amorous adventures. What will impress discerning readers of this classic, rich and fine enough to be bound by no nationality, is its beauty. Read almost where you will, in the first volume or the fifth which has just been published, there is loveliness of some kind. Not a loveliness that shouts and sings, but a beauty touched with melancholy, with what the Japanese call "the ah-ness of things".

Lady Murasaki was a devout Buddhist. As a lady-in-waiting at Court she was able to observe and record a most amazing pageant we cannot find elsewhere. Never for a moment was she deceived by the glitter of Court life. She knew it to be no more than a bubble of sea foam, and human love, with all its passionate vows and poems on tinted paper, unstable as running water. She knew, too, the power of Karma, the wisdom of withdrawal from life and the blessedness of the teaching of the Lord Buddha.

There is a Japanese poem which reads: "Would that my sleeve were wide enough to cover the spaces of the sky; then should the wind no longer at his pleasure scatter the flowers in Spring." That was the poignant cry of Murasaki, and in *The Lady of the Boat* and other parts of *The Tale of Genji* we realise that the Japanese sleeve, with all its beauty of colour and design was never wide enough to shut out the folly and sorrow of a human heart.

HADLAND DAVIS

Osiris: A study in Myths, Mystery and Religion. By H. P. COOKE, M. A. (The C. W. Daniel Company. 5*s.*)

The life of the soul in God and the story of its deep experience has been portrayed in later Schools of Western Mysticism under the symbology of a Second Birth, a Life of Regeneration, a Mystical Death, a Resurrection and an *Ascensio Mentis vel Animae in Deo.* It is implied here and there in Catholic Mysticism, but was adopted more expressly and developed in later types, among the followers of Jacob Böhme and by Louis Claude de Saint-Martin. It is the life of Christ in the soul and the life of the soul in Christ. There is no question that the emblematical representation corresponds literally with the states and stages of the soul's experience on the path of return to God, answering after its own manner to the Eastern recovered knowledge of the Unity. I have been looking all my life for the analogies of this figurative connotation in the annals of the past; and as a student of the Instituted Mysteries there is perhaps no need to add that the doctrine of Rebirth therein and the dramatic presentations of the Death and Resurrection of the God suggested identical experience in pre-Christian days, outside the written records of old. Like others before me, I was brought after this manner into contact with those explanatory hypotheses of the Mysteries which supposed that the Candidate for Initiation took the part of the God in Ritual; that in him the God died and in him also arose. When Mrs. Atwood wrote her *Suggestive Enquiry* into what was termed by her the "Hermetic Mystery" she believed that Adept Hierophants put the Candidate into deep trance and that his soul was led therein through states of inward experience to intellection of the Supreme Oneness. She did not express it thus clearly, for she was bewrayed amidst a cloud of words and images derived from later Platonists; but it was and is easy to see that her thesis was false at the root, for it is not by travelling in the spirit vision or by induced illumination that the mystical end is attained. It is a work in

one's own life. So also it has been easy to see that a later and greater scholarship which still explains the Mysteries as presenting in pageants the story of seedtime and harvest, is reducing them to a hollow show and writes out at full length the judgment of Thomas de Quincey when he affirmed that the Mysteries were the chief imposture of the classical world.

But if seedtime and harvest are the story of the soul in incarnation, life, growth and the great harvesting of death; if that harvesting leads on to other life, symbolised ritually by the ear of corn exhibited in pregnant silence, as if among the Gods in their Olympus, then the Mysteries are not a cheat but at least the showing of a vision. And if the birth, death and resurrection of the God are the story of the soul awakening from sense-illusions to an apprehension of the Great Reality; if the Death of the God is significant of the soul dying to all that itself can perish; and if the Resurrection is to life in God, then the Mysteries in their own day and after their own manner portrayed the story of the soul which dies to earthly things, that it may rise to the knowledge and attainment of those that are eternal. Plotinus, Iamblichus, Porphyry, Proclus—these and the rest of them—testifying to the import of the Mysteries, as understood by them, encourage us to look at the Rites from a point of view like this; but they have left us no evidence that the experience of Candidates was more than that of Minor activities and witness in great ceremonial pageants, in shows that shewed. They took part in processsions, they bore the thyrsus, they went through lustrations; but there was nothing individual. For the rest, having seen and heard, they carried away that which they could and chose.

As regards the Second Birth, Initiation was its actuating cause, by the hypothesis of the whole procedure, whatever the Mythos presented. As regards Figurative Death Mr. A. P. Cooke reminds us, in his study of Osiris, which has occasioned these present reflections, that, according to Julius Firmicus Maternus, "the intending *Mystes* of Attis was admitted as *Moriturus*"—one who is about to die. Obviously, however, the part which he took in the spectacles could communicate nothing automatically. How should Alkibiades, for example, profit by a Figurative Death? As much and as little as many and most of those who pass through the death and raising of the Craft Degrees in Masonry. The Initiations of Eleusis are distinct mythologically, but they took place in crowds, and there is nothing to indicate that even its Greater Mysteries were imparted to a few only, and much less personally to each Postulant. Mr. Cooke presents a talismanic speculation on the Neophyte of alleged Egyptian Rites "acting the part of the deity"; but there is no evidence before us, except that he quotes John Yarker, who wrote long years ago a chaotic volume, entitled *Arcane Schools*, and it was published towads the end of his life by Tait of Belfast. Yarker was one of my correspondents in those days, and so also was the excellent William Oxley who paid a visit to Egypt and returned with revelations which impressed Yarker and no one else presumably in the wide world of research. It is difficult to believe one's eyes when Oxley and Yarker are cited in Mr. Cooke's pages as authorities on Eyptian Antiquities or on any of the Mystery Schools except Freemasonry in the case of him who wrote about *Arcane Schools*. Even on that subject which he had followed in every direction, his contributions are stultified by fantastic hypotheses and by omission of references which would enable his statements to be checked.

Mr. Cooke, who is otherwise of interest, fails threfore—but inevitably—on the most vital point of his thesis; and the subject must be left at this point. There is nothing to help us in the collections of Sir James Fraser on the dying God, or in the research of Sir Wallis Budge on *Osiris and the Egyptian Resurrection*. I remember with gratitude M. Henri Graillot and his *Culte de Cybèle* in Rome and the Roman Empire. The Candidates for simple Initiation in these Mysteries were many (p. 174); but the Rite of Enthronement at the last and highest state (p. 184) presupposes a single *mystes*. Unfortunately they are not of our concern in the present connection. It remains that the Birth, Death and Resurrection of the God in Ritual cannot be affirmed to portray those states and stages of the soul's experience to which I referred at the beginning. A little mixed and confusing, they offered their own lesson of a blessed life hereafter in Elysian Fields. So also the mythological pageants of other Mysteries conveyed analogous messages; but at their best and highest—as it seems to me—the Epopt's Vision of the God has little at this day to tell those who are in search of the Union. Above all, in those rare cases when the Epopt became the God, M. Graillot makes evident unawares how far from the authentic term was the Candidate's spectacular Enthronement.

A. E. WAITE

A History of Fire and Flame. By OLIVER C. DE C. ELLIS. (The Poetry Lovers' Fellowship. Simpkin Marshall, London. 15*s.*)

Poet and scientist, Dr. Ellis has given us an unusual book. He has gone so far in getting behind the differences of vocabulary that he has been able to communicate something of the rapture that follows the discovery of a more unified and unifying point of view, the rapture that transforms and lights up platitudes and everyday taken-for-granted things.

Though he has not fully realized the knowledge of the ancients, he has to see it as "a coincidence of the most extraordinary kind that where the ancients conceived an outer cosmic shell of thin 'Fire' we have found an outer 'stratosphere' whose tenuous outer limits are pure hydrogen". And while he traces the production of fire and power from the early days down through the smoke of coal and oil and gas, polluting and darkening the air, on to the present-day "cleanly cosmic power" of Electricity, the flaming Unicorn—yet his scope does not include the still higher aspects of the energy of fire, the Akasa of the Hindus. Perhaps that is asking too much.

The book opens thus: "Man's first consciousness was of One, and ever and again in the spiral progress of his history he returns to the consciousness of One. At each return it is to a higher conception." So fire, or energy, is one; fire, the primal matter, in all its three transformations, gaseous, liquid, solid,—in other words, fire, air, water, earth; fire, the fuel, fire the producing energy, chemical, mechanical or radiant, fire, the resultant force; fire, "the spirit in prison" the first principle of organic growth, fire, the "band of union," the prime cause of cohesion, fire also manifest in disintegration and strife; and so on, with a wealth of detail from Greek Roman, Egyptian and ancient American.

The second idea is that of duality; fire-water, sun-moon, heat-cold, light-dark, good-evil, macrocosm-microcosm, every thing or concept having its opposite pole, yet each member of the pairs of opposites having its own lesser polarity; the sun was friendly or cruel as Saturn, the moon beneficent or maleficent; fire was pure or impure, celestial or terrestrial; and so on, in infinite divisibility of positive and negative. So modern science finds that "No phenomenon nowadays can be considered as completely explained in terms of molecular behaviour, however, or even of atomic behaviour" the explanation being electrical. The water molecule, for example, is polar, and by adding such polar molecules to a mixture of inflammable gases, the process of combustion may be aided. "It is the old alliance of Fire with its dearest enemy."

The third idea is that of the trinity: the sulphur, mercury, salt of the Alchemists; spirit, soul and body; hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen; these three are also found in the previous aspects of Unity. Science, with the help of the technical refinements of photography finds that

the production of a flame is also threefold; 1) rise in temperature with flameless combustion and partial oxidation producing 2) an explosive mixture of gases which ignite 3) as a visible flame. Again "in every gas explosion, there are these three phenomena, a wind travelling through the burned gas, a wind of opposite direction travelling through the unburned gases, and the radiant shell of luminous gas where the two winds stand back to back as they blow." This "radiant self-blown bubble," whose photo is shown, is strikingly reminiscient of the Brahmanical Golden Egg of the World, and the Cosmos as the Son of the two forces, centrifugal, centripetal, that transfer it from subjectivity into objectivity.

This brings us to the strangest point about the book. Apparently Dr. Ellis has not yet discovered that the Eastern writings and the records gathered by H. P. Blavatsky are full of information about Fire. Indeed they broaden the vision and link up the knowledge of the ages still more than this book can do, since it deals chiefly with phenomenal fire,—it suggests, for example, that the secret of the philosopher's stone was simply the production of oxygen. Its author writes in one place that "an intuition, inherently poetic, commonly precedes the factual proofs of science," and in writing of the noumenal intelligence of fire, the Fire of Mind, the Fire of Soul, he himself seems to show rather the intuitional sensing of the poet than the self-conscious knowledge of the scientist. Yet the fiery science of the soul is as capable of factual proof as the science of the phenomenal world. Perhaps Dr. Ellis will make the experiment. With *The Secret Doctrine*, the Puranas and other Indian works, as fuel for his ideation, his next book should be still more vividly 'illumined'.

W. W.

The Zohar (The Book of the Splendour.) By Dr. ARIEL BENSION (George Routledge, London. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

The Zohar. Translated by HARRY SPERLING and MAURICE SIMON. (The Soncino Press, London.)

Nothing could be more gratifying, to the optimist, than the stream of books which pours from the press on mysticism. Publishers are not philanthropists; they are out to make money. The supply, therefore, indicates a growing demand. Since mysticism means an effort to come to terms with Reality, this demand is a sign of serious intention to tackle the problems of life. More than that, since mysticism is universal in outlook, it shows a determination to rise above the barriers of creed, caste and race.

One form of mysticism—the Jewish—has, however, long been neglected—even by the Jews. It is not known to so wide a public as, say, the Hindu, Buddhist, Sufi, or Christian. This Sir Denison Ross points out in his admirable introduction and he suggests that "the reason for this absence of public curiosity with regard to the religious beliefs of the Jews is in a great measure due to our familiarity with their Bible." That is precisely the trouble. The fierce Jehovah of the Old Testament presides over a religion fraught with endless formalities (when it is not drowned in brutality); he suggests nothing so much as a blood-thirsty, domineering old man with occasional lapses of senile indulgence for a favourite and very spoilt child. It never occurs to us to look further; the idea that rich mines of mystic ore are concealed under the cinders of Judaism, is not one that enters our heads.

Yet, in that, we are wrong. Dr. Bension is at pains to prove it in the most remarkable book on the subject that has appeared in the English tongue. Himself a mystic and a great scholar, he succeeds in impressing our minds with his own enthusiasm, lifting us into a new realm of mystical delights. His work is the more timely in that it appears simultaneously with the first complete English translation of *The Zohar.*

What is the *Zohar?* A cabbalistic work written mainly in the Aramaic language. It takes the form of a commentary on the Pentateuch, and is intended to reveal the hidden meaning of the biblical narrative and the divine commands. "It is a complete thesaurus of Jewish mysticism, theosophy, and occult traditions." Dr. Bension is of the opinion that it was compiled in Spain in the thirteenth century, but that its roots lie far down in the accumulation of ancient Jewish learning and literature. Whatever its origin, it undoubtedly exerted a powerful influence on Jewish medieval life, and helped and guided the race during centuries of persecution and degradation. It inspired some of the greatest mystics of the modern world.

The *Zohar* (known sometimes as the *Bible of the Mystics*) is impregnated with the colour and beauty that tinged Jewish life in the Spanish Peninsula, strengthening the belief that its last revision occurred in that country, where three great faiths—the Jewish, the Christian, and the Mohammedan—developed and brought forth some of the finest fruits of their mystical inspiration. "Warmed by the same sun, nourished by the same original source of Faith, they grew side by side, resembling and influencing each other on the spiritual plane, even as children of one family resemble and influence each other on the physical plane." Yet each made a distinct contribution of its own, and it is with the special contribution of Israel that Dr. Bension's book deals. Clearly mysticism apart, this work is an eminently valuable contribution to the study of comparative religion. It links up three great sources of religious inspiration at a time of travails when a new age was coming painfully to birth. The *Zohar* was a third addition (after the *Bible* and the *Talmud*)—in some ways the greatest—to the spiritual treasure of Israel.

The mysticism that emanated from Spain, Dr. Bension tells us, differed from that of other countries in various ways. The Spanish mystics followed vision with action, believing it to be their duty to purify life and every action of life. The burning love kindled in their hearts at the moment of union with the Infinite, remained to influence their attitude and actions towards their fellowmen. They thought it their duty to express by their actions and mode of living, the brightness, the goodness and the love they had had the good fortune to draw into themselves, thus making their lives an example for less exalted mortals.

> All through the *Zohar*, in the description of the creation, the pantheistic idea predominates. God creates and continues to exist in all things: both in the hidden and in the revealed. Both in the seen and in the unseen worlds. Both in physical matter and in spiritual essence. Both in animate and in inanimate objects.

This is a great advance on the usual anthropomorphic quality of Jewish theology. No doubt it is in some degree due to Moslem influence, particularly that of Ibn Arabi, whose works preceded the *Book of the Splendour.* The Arab mystics taught especially—and here the *Zohar* seems to follow them—that ecstasy emanating from the intuition is greater than that emanating from the reason; that there is a universal spirit from which all other spirits are derived; and "that man, who is able to reach the heights by means of his ecstasy, is the most perfect thing in creation".

The *Zohar* interprets the ordinary Bible stories metaphysically. Thus it regards the Garden of Eden as the dwelling-place of the soul in the future life. Adam's nakedness before his fall from grace is the luminous and spiritual nakedness of the soul before coming into this world. Adam's expulsion from the Garden of Eden is the soul's descent to the world of men. The garments of skins with which he covered up his nakedness, are the opaque bodies which cover and tarnish the pure light of the soul. Only virtue can give back to the soul the sublime transparence of its pristine state. Should the soul have failed to find this virtue before leaving the body, it is unable to ascend higher until it has been purified by further tests. This leads us to the question of

re-incarnation. Evidently that doctrine formed part of the teaching of the *Zohar*, for it is mentioned in one of the revelations :—

If the soul which is placed here below fails to take roots, it is withdrawn again and again and transplanted until it has taken root. For the soul which has not achieved its task on earth, is withdrawn and transplanted again on earth. Unhappy is the soul that is obliged to return to earth to repair the mistakes made by the man whose body it animated ! For transmigration is inflicted as a punishment on the soul—a punishment that varies according to the nature of the sins the soul has committed. And every soul that has sinned, must return to earth until, by its perfection, it is able to attain to the sixth degree of the region whence it emanated . . . . . Nor can the soul experience any real joy until it feels itself wearing its own heavenly form once more.

Such is the *Zohar*.

Like all books of the human spirit, which embody the divine quality, this book was destined to become the immortal possession of all humanity, because its truths lie within our own soul. . . . . In the revelations of the *Zohar* men may find his transcendental ego, even as he may find it in the high moments that occur in the visions of the seers, the prophets and the divine singers. Its secrets make the wonders of creation transparent to our eyes, as a house of mysteries seen through glass.

RONALD A. L. ARMSTRONG

CORRESPONDENCE

CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION IN INDIA

The feature of the Report of the Commission on Christian Higher Education in India (Oxford University Press), which will be of chief interest to readers of THE ARYAN PATH is the proposal for extra-mural extension of the work of universities and colleges in India. This proposal is put forward both for Christian and non-Christian colleges, as a means of integrating Academe in the life of the masses. The idea is that members of college staffs should be enabled to spend time in research-work, not on academic questions of the ordinary type, but on questions of immediate practical import to the life of India, particularly to the life of the villages. It would be for the college to arrange that the results of such research should be made available to the practical men within whose sphere they fall and whose function it would be to apply them.

As an indication of the kind of work possible in this direction the Report prints in an appendix suggestions made by the staffs of the Training Schools for Rural Teachers at Moga, (Punjab), and Chapra, (Bengal). They suggest among other things research into rural economics, under such headings as :—

Family income of the villager,
Family expenditure of the villager,
Indebtedness of the villager, extent and causes,
Rates of interest,
Forms of Co-operative effort now in use and possible developments.

Other headings under which investigations are suggested include :—

Systems of village government,
Systems of administration of justice,
Systems of credit,
Systems of land tenure,
education, (literacy and illiteracy, psychology etc.), religion, public health and hygiene, nature study and science, the traditions of the people, agriculture and animal husbandry, literature.

This proposal for University extension of a kind applicable to India does seem to open up fruitful possibilities. The commission suggest it as one means of bridging the gulf between the educated classes and the ordinary citizen which has been bridged in England by another

kind of University extension, a gulf which, they say, is greater in India today than ever it was in nineteenth century England. The commission wish very laudably to correct a situation in which, "the University education which is intended to fit men for the higher professions and the Government service does not fit them to understand the actual needs of the ordinary people whom they have to serve".

I was speaking about the report the other day with the Chairman of the Commission, the Master of Balliol, and he mentioned another maladjustment incidental to the university system in India, *viz.* the vast unemployment among graduates and the appalling fact that the average income for a male graduate in India is Rs. 25 per month : (the situation is quite different among women graduates, who are far fewer in number and whose average income is Rs. 250 per month). The situation as it affects male graduates clearly needs to be dealt with by a diminution of the numbers attending university institutions: and this should be done by a raising of the standard of work. The latter aim would be achieved by a broadening of the basis of study, in which the Commission suggest that the Christian colleges should take the lead.

The report is well worth studying by any one who is interested in the Indian university system.

London C. R. KING

JAPAN AND CHINA

I am in complete agreement with the contention of Professor Kiang Kang-Hu in the July issue of THE ARYAN PATH, that China and Japan should endeavour so to direct their policies towards each other as to restore their traditional relations, of old friendship. The brief historical sketch of these old relations as given by the writer calls for some correction, without entering into details.

With reference to Prof. Kiang's explanation of the old Chinese name, O-Nu, for Japan or the Japanese, which he identifies with that of the aborigines of the country, Ainu or Aino, I can only say that I read it with great interest, being much struck with the ingenuity of the hypothesis. Neither have I anything to say against the interesting account of the Hsu-Fu (or in Japanese "Jo-Fuku") expedition, or of the early "colonization" of the Japanese islands by Chinese, Korean, and Malayan adventurers. On the racial composition of the Japanese people, opinion is so widely divided even among scholars and specialists that I will refrain from all comment either in support or in criticism oi Prof. Kiang's view, that " at least three-fourths of the modern Japanese are of Chinese blood, chiefly of the Han race".

With the assured feeling that my sentiment will be shared by all my compatriots, let me now pay my most heartfelt tribute to the Chinese people, or at least to their great ancestors, for the cultural debt which we of the Island Empire have owed them. The enormous obligations under which we find ourselves to our continental neighbours can never be exaggerated, and we are perhaps even more sensible of this fact than is the average Chinese himself. Prof. Kiang is right in his view that the native religion Shinto itself has not escaped Chinese influence, and that our Buddhism is more Chinese than Indian in many senses. As for Confucianism, it is often asserted by Japanese scholars that the true spirit of the Master's teachings lives more in Japan than in his native land. Even in military art before our contact with the West we owed more to the Chinese than is commonly supposed, and our students of tactics still make careful studies of the works of ancient Chinese strategists, such as Wu-tzu and Sun-tzu. In short, it is impossible to imagine a Japan without Chinese guidance in the past.

Having said so much with pleasure and gratitude, I now feel bound to say that many of my compatriots will resent the statement which Prof. Kiang makes on the authority of the "Chinese dynasties histories," to the effect that from 108 B. C. Japan was for centuries "a regular tributary to China". He cites

alleged facts from those records to support his statement. That periodic missions were sent from Japan to the Chinese Court with friendly greetings and gifts, is a fact beyond all dispute. But I seriously doubt the accuracy of the statement, among others, that Japan was required to acknowledge " the supremacy of the Chinese emperor " through her envoys, or " tribute-bearers ". The fact must be borne in mind that the Chinese are celebrated for their love of grand *names* for themselves, sometimes even at the expense of actual rights and powers, and further that they have for untold centuries delighted to look upon their own country as the hub of the world. The very name of Chung Hua Min Kuo, or " the Central Flowery People's Country, " which they have adopted for their republic founded in the present century, is but an example. They have always loved to regard all the adjacent lands their tributaries or dependencies. Korea was several times brought under Chinese influence in a way and to an extent that Japan never was; but this domination was by no means uninterrupted, and yet the Chinese seem to have looked upon Korea *always* as a dependency, even when their influence was scarcely felt there.

It is true that certain military chiefs in the island of Kyushu, which lies nearest to Korea, sent envoys of homage to China and otherwise acted as tributaries to her in their anxiety to ensure and increase their own influence under Chinese patronage, but the real Japanese Court in Honshu, or the Main Island of Japan, never acknowledged the supremacy of China.

When Hideyoshi, the great Japanese military leader, attempted the conquest of Korea in the 16th century, the Ming dynasty of China sought to pacify him by appointing him " King of Japan". But Hideyoshi grew furious with indignation and tore the letter of appointment, declaring that if he so desired it, he could become what he liked without a word from the Chinese Court, but that none but the direct descendants of the First Emperor of Japan might assume imperial dignity.

Prof. Kiang says that, whereas China has been rid of the feudal system since 221 B. C., Japan lived in it until 1871. That is true, but the Japanese feudal system proper *began* many centuries later than the Chinese—namely, after the system of civil government modelled on the T'ang (Chinese) pattern had begun gradually to decline in efficiency in the 12th or 13th century. Prof. Kiang refers to the fact that Japan has had from time immemorial only one imperial family vested with kingly rights, while all those powerful military leaders, like Hideyoshi, who had the actual reins of government in their hands for centuries prior to the Restoration of Meiji, acted at least in the name of the emperor. This is a unique feature of Japanese history of which we are, I think, rightly proud. It is a fact of great moral significance which cannot be so summarily disposed of as does Prof. Kiang by saying that the imperial house was for ages a mere figurehead. Indeed, its moral importance is more fully felt than explained by the average Japanese, whose reverence for the Imperial House to-day partakes much of the nature of religious sentiment.

With the opinion of Prof. Kiang that Japan and China should "set about, in a spirit of amity, the reconciliation of their differences," I concur most heartily. But would the mere "recollection, by both parties, of the fraternal if not filial relationship which exists between them" be sufficient to induce them to work for the desired restoration of friendship in anything like real earnest? Each must recognize and understand more fully the position and claims of the other.

Yokkaichi, Japan M. G. MORI

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"————*ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."

HUDIBRAS.

It is an observed fact that often human beings suffer from the defects of their qualities; a virtue exaggerated becomes a weakness. The quality of patience develops into sloth, that of detachment into carelessness, that of resignation into dangerous parasitism. Our civilization based on metal and run by machine has now overreached itself. Especially in the U.S.A., the most prolific mother of machine inventions, the symptoms leave no doubt, and so we hear more voices against human enslavement by machinery intelligently raised there than in any other part of the world.

Mr. Stuart Chase has once again taken field and has commenced a series of articles "A New Deal for America," in *The New Republic*, the first of which appears in the issue of 29th June —" Nemesis of Progress". The following quotations give us the gist of his thought and argument:—

To all intents and purposes, our industrial plant is magnificently completed. We have not only the shoe factories, but the blast furnaces, textile mills, office buildings, wheat fields, automobile establishments, printing shops, pulp mills, coal mines, oil wells, what you will, to turn out a stream of consumers' goods sufficient to overwhelm poverty and immeasurably raise the standard of living. Now! In certain fields we have *overbuilt* beyond any reasonable demand; shoes are one example and woollens another. Yet labour and management, supported by bankers and creditors, supported in turn by savings seeking profitable investment, go on rearing the capital structure to the skies. Look at the towers of Manhattan; look at the new mills of North Carolina; look at the new mechanized cotton farms of Texas. Virtually half of the total investment in the United States in recent years is never put to work, while on all of it is snugly laid a blanket of indebtedness carrying a huge volume of fixed charges. The "profitable" investment demands its profit—and rent and interest. But the underlying plant is increasingly incapable of earning a profit because of inadequate utilization.

The nineteenth-century formula has overreached itself. . . . .

In the United States, we have at present time a shoe-factory capacity estimated at some 900,000,000 pairs a year. We buy about 300,000,000 pairs and could hardly wear out 500,000,000 pairs. Yet new shoe factories in normal times are constantly being built. Bankers loan money to their promoters. The "extension" of the shoe business is held to be a cardinal requisite to progress, prosperity, employment. Meanwhile, the existing shoe-plant stands on the average two-thirds empty. The resulting appalling burden of overhead costs forces manufacturer after manufacturer into bankruptcy—and always will. We have the plant, but we cannot make adequate use of it. Jam yesterday, jam to-morrow, but never jam to-day. Men want jobs; people want shoes. But men cannot go to work in these all but empty shoe factories. . . . .

If we had no money system, but used requisition tickets, all this would be plain as a pikestaff. The veil of money tends to obscure the common sense of underlying factors. . . . .

No thought has been given to the idea of resting for a moment and enjoying the fruits of our labors. Such an eventuality has never entered into financial or technical computations. The devil was after us, and we must not stop; quite terrible things were sure to happen if we did. On being asked *what* things, the typical reaction of the honest citizen is to express amazement, pain and ultimately rage. "What!" he shouts, "would you destroy progress?" . . . .

"Progress," my eye. The system called capitalism may need it to keep going, but *we* do not need it. It would be a jolly good thing to declare a moratorium on inventions for at least a decade, and treat all inventors as dangerous lunatics, with proper care and supervision. The quarrel is not with technical improvements as such, but with the rate of introduction. . . . .

Technical "progress" presents certain other dangers of almost equal importance. Progress in mechanized warfare, for instance, promises to end all hope of real progress for generations in the next first-class conflict. Industrial progress is fostering technological unemployment at a rate far in excess of our present power to find new work for the men and women displaced. . . . .

Natural resources are all being ruthlessly and wastefully exploited under the compulsions of technical progress. . . . .

I would soberly estimate that half of the natural resources torn from the earth in the last hundred years have gone to make that filth, which Ruskin termed the opposite of wealth—junk and litter and waste. . . . .

Milk is good for growing babies, but a quart an hour would be disastrous. One of the best hopes for obtaining some real progress in the future is to bottle up technical progress, and feed it out with a measuring cup.

And with that we must turn to *The Atlantic* for August in which is given a strange remedy for this international disease; the American woman is told—"Put your husband in the kitchen".

A blind woman who sees, a deaf woman who hears the roar of machines and the cry of hearts, a dumb woman whose voice penetrates and appeals. Such is Helen Keller, who a few weeks ago amazed the British Medical Association by demonstrating her powers to lecture and to conduct a piece of music played on the piano. But what has Helen Keller to say about the chaos of our machine-made civilization?

In a fascinating article in the August *Atlantic* it is Helen Keller who writes the prescription—"Put your husband in the Kitchen". She is "convinced that machine has taken something out of life". "But the machine is with us today, and our task is to turn it to our proper need." "From my detached position I have tried to examine the whole problem from a humanitarian and commonsense point of view." She contrasts the reaction of the man in business and the woman at home to the new machine-inventions.

The average woman is not very familiar with the complexities of economics, but it seems to me that she has ordered her household economy upon a more solid basis than that upon which men have arranged the affairs of their larger world. In industry, the amazing increase in the use of labor-saving machinery has brought about over-production, unemployment, and widespread suffering. Either women are wiser or they have a sounder instinct for economics. At any rate they use labor-saving devices for the heretical purpose of saving labor, and in doing so they have, I think, demonstrated in their homes a practical object lesson in economics which their husbands would do well to master. While theorists are still searching for the causes of the depression, and politicians remain at loggerheads in their efforts to conjure up remedies, I am tempted to think that the perplexed business man might discover a possible solution of his troubles if he would just spend a few days in his wife's kitchen.

Then she paints a picture: Mrs. Jones having put her husband to the job of developing the kitchen on strictly business lines, surprising results ensue—absurd and amusing antics in the kitchen but which are grim realities of the factory and the office.

There are many Mr. Joneses who acted no less foolishly in their own sphere of large-scale industry, expanding plants and piling up goods with complete disregard of market demand. It may be argued that the parallel I have drawn is not a fair one because the family unit is small and static, that its requirements can be easily gauged, while there is no element of competition in supplying these requirements. But the nation, after all, is only the sum of these small units, and with proper co-operation it should not be impossible to estimate, within certain limits, the amount of goods the nation needs.

A third American, Walter Lippmann, the well-known author and publicist, has also something vital to say on this subject. Delivering an address to the National Conference of Social Work at Philadelphia (published in *The New English Weekly* for 21st July) he referred to "the anxieties, the paralyzing fears, the broken bodies and the broken spirits which the world-wide mismanagement and confusion entail". The cause of this mismanagement?

The solution of that problem depends upon changes in human motives as great as those which distinguish a feudal peasant from the modern business man. . . . . If the descendants of the modern business man are to operate a social order in which personal initiative is to be combined with public responsibility, his motives will have to change as radically in the next centuries as they have in the past. . . . . We do not have the wisdom and the disinterestedness to manage with any assurance the volume of credit which determines the rhythm of economic enterprise. We do not have the wisdom and disinterestedness to make the world secure against war. We do not have the wisdom and disinterestedness to plan and arrange the growth of our cities or the future of agriculture or the balance between agriculture and industry.

In another place ("The Scholar in a Troubled World," *The Atlantic* for August) Mr. Lippmann states that "the theoretical study of public affairs does not, and cannot, provide the immediate practical wisdom to manage public affairs"; this because where knowledge is to be applied to action "there is a highly variable and incalculable factor—the will of the people". "The art of practical decision, the art of determining which of several ends to pursue, which of many means to employ, when to strike and when to recoil, comes from intui-

tions that are more unconscious than the analytical judgment." And so we arrive at the question—how can intuition be developed? How can we become "subtly sensitive to the atmosphere" around, so that we are "able to see in the dark"?

A very Theosophical method is advocated by Mr. Lippmann in which modern India will find a practical message:—

> I doubt whether the student can do a greater work for his nation in this grave moment of its history than to detach himself from its preoccupations, refusing to let himself be absorbed by distractions about which, as a scholar, he can do almost nothing. For this is not the last crisis in human affairs. The world will go on somehow, and more crises will follow. It will go on best, however, if among us there are men who have stood apart, who refused to be anxious or too much concerned, who were cool and inquiring, and had their eyes on a longer past and a longer future. By their example they can remind us that the passing moment is only a moment; by their loyalty they will have cherished those things which only the disinterested mind can use.

Why have we quoted at length these views? Because they justify the Theosophical attitude of H. P. Blavatsky, half a century ago. Madame Blavatsky with a belief in and a knowledge of the Law of Cycles repeatedly told the western world that the day of reckoning was near at hand; she insistently pointed out that the western thinking was pursuing a wrong course and that the western views of life were rooted in unhealthy soil and that the outcome could not but be confusion and disaster. She also pointed out the grave responsibility of the West in influencing Asia through its military and commercial exploits. To the East she equally gave warning to the effect that salvation will not come through western science unless it is aided and energized by eastern philosophy. She raised her voice at the east copying west without discrimination and analysis. In the above quoted opinions Indians have a message, though it is different from that they give to Europeans and Americans.

Mr. Stuart Chase demands "a moratorium on inventions and would treat all inventors as dangerous lunatics"; Helen Keller states that "if the progress of the mechanical age should suddenly cease now, I should say that its disadvantages had outweighed its benefits". Do not these words contain a message for countries like China, India and Persia; Japan copied the western system of production and supply early, before Europe and America had found out their mistake and Japan must inevitably pay for copying indiscriminately the west; but those Asiatic countries which for one reason or another do not find themselves burdened with the blunders of the mechanical age have an opportunity to learn by observation and avoid going through the experience of collapse the West is facing.

ॐ

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light ! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. III NOVEMBER 1932 No. 11

SICK AT HEART

The world is sick. Everybody talks about it. Everybody also talks about the achievements of Science, and about knowledge of which there is no dearth, and yet the world is sick. Of food there is plenty and yet hungry people walk the streets. Factories turn out clothes and shoes and boots, and yet men and women and children are in rags. This sickness is traced to the great War, and while in one part of the world disarmament is talked about, in another arms are being sharpened for ready use ; the impotent League of Nations goes on cerebrating.

The intellect of humanity is not sick ; however great the quantity of false knowledge, there is sufficient appreciation of what is true: who does not know that sacrifice, co-operation, brotherliness are the remedies? Why are they not applied? There is a gulf between apperception of a fact and its effective use. The will to do must be developed. Our humanity suffers from a weak will, and is not able to do that which it perceives as right. It is sick at heart.

What are some of the symptoms of this ailment ?

The economic crisis reveals how widespread is the false value assigned to the purchasing power of money and metal.

For example: Those who have lost some of their millions consider themselves wiped out—yet they have enough to indulge in things which are downright luxuries to others. Or this: In America impoverished masses are a new phenomenon and every body is talking about it ; in India it is no phenomenon but a normal condition of existence for decades

and there is none so rich as to offer it remedy. The impoverished masses of America may be called the well-to-do compared to the Indian ryot.

Values ought to be assigned to things in terms of necessity. But Maya veils our vision. There is really no lack of clothes and food. The world is not suffering from poverty but from extravagance. All people have a strongly developed sense of possession and even those who are able to satisfy it, are full of discontent. Confusion about luxuries and necessities confounds us more and more.

How has this arisen? Through false ideas about *social* status. Competition on the plane of economics is a reflection of the more subtle competition in the social sets. To keep up appearances implies extravagance as well as exploitation of human feelings and emotions. In society, one set exploits another; there is competition on the field of mere appearances, and the race is so wildly and persistently run that men and women in society lose sight of moral values. For example, small talk, shop talk and gossip, (and, not only rarely, gossip which is cruel) are almost necessities of the smart set, and even in the "religious and conservative India" some have begun aping this abomination of the west. Rich people who run down political bolshevism are so often themselves social anarchists, who "will do as they please," and are regardless of decorum and decencies of a real *social* life, one in which our neighbours may not be loved as our brethren, but in which at least they would be regarded as having some claim on our consideration.

This heart-disease is caused by selfishness—selfishness in high places being copied by others. Selfishness is the prolific mother of human vices, lie being born out of the necessity for dissembling, and hypocrisy out of the desire to mask lie. We live and move and have our being in the omnipresent force called respectability whose trinitarian aspects are sham, humbug, falsehood.

There is so much of charity—with what is left over! There is so much kindness, appreciation, and helpfulness for the poor—when we are not busy with the rich! There is so much of social service rendered—because it feels good! People fool themselves and ease their conscience and think that they are unselfish and considerate when they are only indulging in ill-conceived gifts which often go to the undeserved and more often strengthen pauperism and slave-mentality.

Turn from the smart society to certain so-called literary and artistic sets. There is hypocritical verbiage about soul and spirit and self-expression; among them are numerous leaders and teachers to whom the old Upanishadic definition applies—

अन्धेनैव नीयमाना यथान्धाः ॥

Blind leading the blind.

There is another Maya which

envelops large masses: "This is an economic disease and a proper adjustment between capital and labour, between production and distribution, will heal all our ills," say they. What are the *moral* roots of the tree of capital? What are the real causes which produce a poverty-stricken society? Lack of moral perception and of moral stamina.

Masseurs are handling its economic limbs, and educators are injecting information in its head, but the sick heart of humanity is left unnursed. What is the remedy? Neither political legislation nor social-service will avail. The politician who preaches prohibition but drinks, the social servant who bestows charity but is ignorant of what sacrifice means, educator who "can easier teach twenty what were good to be done, than be one of the twenty to follow" his own injunctions—these cannot inspire humanity to awaken to verities and realities.

Individuals who are self-induced to better themselves, who seek knowledge and a discipline of life, who will try not to save other peoples' bodies and minds, but their own souls, will become the real saviours of this civilization. When a few at least will give up the habit of following leaders, when a few at least demand that preachment and practice *shall* go together and set out to supply that demand in their own selves and in their own lives, they will start reform along the *only* right line—from within without. Some souls must become the centres of life which inspire and energize their families and friends, not by precept only but by example also.

Control of self and discipline in life will beget a luminous mind, an enlightened sense of charity and an impersonal service. It is the leaven of such a few earnest hearts which will raise the status of the whole of humanity. The very existence of such individuals in a single community will beget a Social Order which honours the rights of man through a proper discharge by men of their duties. Such a Social Order among a single community or country, would expand and encircle other races and lands. Such a Social Order implies that each kingdom and nation has a message to give to the world for the edification of sister kingdoms and nations, and in giving that message each earns for itself the privilege of learning from others.

The work must begin with the individuals. Discipline in life has suffered a reverse these many years, and those who practise discipline will become and will be recognized as the true leaders. Their wealth of wisdom, simplicity of life, and uncorruptibility of nature will act as transmitters of that which is the true, the good, and the beautiful in one.

THE CURSE OF RELIGIONS

[**Joseph Gaer's** novel *Legend called Meryom* was published in 1928. He is also the author of two folk-lore volumes, *The Magic Flight* and *The Burning Bush*. In 1929 he wrote a popular study of *How the Great Religions Began*. This article is Theosophical in its condemnation of religions and in its appeal for Universal Brotherhood founded on the Gospel of Knowledge.—EDS.]

There are undoubtedly as many ways of classifying ignorance as there are for the classification of knowledge. But all classes of ignorance are divisible into two groups: (*a*) Lack of knowledge due to the inability of obtaining or receiving data; and (*b*) Lack of knowledge due to the deliberate exclusion of obtainable data.

To the former belongs our entire nescience of the greater part of the mysterious realities that surround us, though their existence is sometimes demonstrated to us deductively, and through channels more intuitive than sensorial.

The mind, ever eager to solve mysteries and to discover the unknowable, chafes under its own limitations. And often, in its attempt to attain the unattainable, indulges in delusive speculation that, having no basis in fact, has no basis in truth.

Much harm has resulted when such speculation was resolved into a presumably logical system and presented to the credulous as a science.

But it is in the realm of the second group of ignorance (ignorance deliberately imposed where knowledge is obtainable) that man is the greatest offender. And in no department of human activity has this offence been so persistently lamentable as in the mosque, church and synagogue where, within the shadow of the gods, ignorance was and is utilized as a power to breed misunderstanding and to cultivate hatred.

Neither the differences of language nor the differences of race and colour were ever responsible for as much enmity among the nations as the artificial barriers set up by religious propagandists who, having asserted that theirs was "the only true revealed religion," proceeded to brand all other faiths as the teachings of Satan and their followers as the children of the Devil.

China is often singled out with ridicule and scorn for Emperor T'sin's patriotic attempt to isolate his Empire from the rest of the world by building a wall around it. How much more subject to scorn are the religions East and West which set up spiritual walls around their faiths and pronounce all those without their walls as doomed to eternal damnation?

This deliberate isolation of a religious experience from all other religious experiences of mankind, crowning it with exclusive claims to divine revelation, is not only contrary to the will and concepts of the great spiritual teachers throughout history, but it is also in complete contradiction to the very essence of true religion, which may be defined as the craving in the human soul for a universal unity.

This craving for a Universal Unity or a Brotherhood of Man has found utterance not only in religion but also in the highest expression of art, literature and ethics. Poets of every age interpreted it in some form or another.

Yet so thorough is the deliberate exclusiveness of most fanatical ecclesiasticism that the duty to spread the gospel which would bind each follower "to fear himself, and love all human kind" is forgotten, and the study of religions other than one's own is forbidden and denounced as soul-destroying.

The attempt is rather to keep the followers of one religion from any knowledge of the teachings of other religions and each one to claim for his own unparalleled loftiness of aspiration, unique in the history of religion.

The gospel of Love is certainly a gospel that evokes reverence and admiration. Yet I am certain that it would come as an unpleasant shock rather than as a pleasant revelation to most believers in the West to learn that the Chinese sage, Confucius, frequently expounded this gospel of Love.

Said Confucius:—

"To love mankind, that is love."

"To hold dear the effort more than the prize may be called love."

"Love makes all things look beautiful. Lover offers peace. When love is at stake, my children, yield not to an army."

"A heart set on love can do no wrong."

How strange it sometimes seems that people are unable to grasp the fact that just as the very notion and concept of God involves, necessarily, the concept of a universal unity, even so does the concept of a universal unity hold the gospel of Love, and it must therefore be innate in the teachings of *every* religion.

What is true of the gospel of Love is also true of the gospel of Salvation and the gospel of the Good Deed.

"From Good must come Good and from Evil must come Evil," said the Buddha.

No matter in what other words this truth is uttered, it remains the same in essence.

One can go through the teachings of *any* of the great religions and find their counterparts in most of the other great religions, differing only in form, differing only in non-essentials.

Ordinarily one would expect a glowing appreciation on the part of theologians at the realization that love of mankind and the search for the true and the good is universal and has always found utterance from the lips of profound teachers. But it seems the weakness of most established churches to find it necessary to glorify their particular creeds with the claim of exclusive revelation, and to protect their claim

by surrounding themselves with walls shutting out the teachings of others.

The results of these claims to exclusive godliness are only too well known. Almost every page in human history contains a record of bloodshed perpetrated in the name of the Gospel of Exclusive Truth of one dominant religious group or another.

It is not my purpose to record here the effects of religious persecution in the past. It is rather my intention to state the need for the dissemination of the general knowledge of all religions in the historical manner.

The late Lord Haldane, in an article in *The Hibbert Journal* for July, 1928, wrote:

> The purpose of what I have written . . . is to draw attention to the fact that under wholly divergent forms the great religions of the East and of the West have more of a common substratum than we here suppose . . . East is not so dissevered from West as we are apt to assume in our practice.

But our practice to assume that the East is so thoroughly diverse from the West in its attitude toward life and its religious ideals and practices arises only through our ignorance of the philosophy and the religions of the East—an ignorance, as I have already pointed out, in which we have deliberately cloaked ourselves, or, to be more exact, an ignorance in which our clergy have deliberately cloaked us just, perhaps, as the East has cloaked itself in ignorance of the ideals and the spiritual values of the West.

Religion, in the widest sense of the word, is our birthright. Just as boys and girls of our day are given some freedom to choose their life vocations, they ought to be equally free to follow their inclinations in matters of religious experience—the experience that pervades all other experiences of life.

It is, of course, the duty of parents and teachers to guide the young and cultivate their discriminating faculties in all subjects, outside of religion. But it is equally their duty to present to their youth all obtainable knowledge within their grasp on *all* religions.

If humanity is to reach that ideal goal toward which it is presumably moving, it must first learn to use knowledge as its means of certain advance. And education ought to begin with the young.

The circumscribed and narrow creed within a creed, nurtured on ignorance and hatred, must go. The religion of the future, as the entire society of the future, will have to relinquish competitive and selfish ideals for co-operative ideals that will benefit the entire group within which the individual functions.

Before human society can reach its lofty goal, it will have to accept the Gospel of Knowledge. For the Road of Knowledge alone leads to Universal Brotherhood.

JOSEPH GAER

KARMA AS A THEORY OF RETRIBUTION

[In our March number **Dr. Jagadisan M. Kumarappa** wrote about Karma as a philosophical theory of causation; in the following article he makes some psychological applications. Those of our readers who desire to pursue the study of this practical aspect of the Law of Ethical Causation are recommended to study the U. L. T. Pamphlet, No. 6, which contains an exposition of the Law, and also two other articles on "The Moral Law of Compensation" and "Is Poverty Bad Karma?" and No. 21 which contains "Aphorisms on Karma" useful for practical application.—EDS.]

"He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit of the spirit shall reap life everlasting." In other words, we reap what we sow. Such, in brief, is the Law of Karma in the field of human action. Since whatever happens is the effect of an anterior cause, there is nothing uncertain or capricious in the moral world any more than there is in the physical. Naturally therefore our happiness or misery is the fruit of what we ourselves have done in the past rather than the award of a power residing outside of us. In obedience to this law of ethical causation, a man's good actions propagate goodness and bad actions, evil, in the agent himself first, and then through him in others, thus disturbing the balanced harmony of the Universe. But then, how do the actions of Yesterday affect the life of To-day? That is precisely the way the causal law operates in order to restore the disturbed equilibrium in the physical world and the broken harmony in the moral world. Resting on blind justice, the Law of Karma, like the Supreme Deity it represents, allows each cause, small or great, to work out its inevitable effects, and gives back to every man the actual consequences of his actions without mercy or wrath.

In view of the fact that the moral world rests on the postulate of absolute justice and equity, Madame Blavatsky speaks of this aspect of Karma as the Law of Retribution. If it is true that whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap, it must be equally true, says the advocate of Karma, that whatsoever a man reaps that he must have also sown. His personal traits, his woe and weal, his sex and status in life,—in short, all the circumstances of his lot are explicable, he maintains, only on the basis of this law of retribution. But cause and effect can be thus linked in the moral world only if there is an infinite succession of lives. For only then can the effects be brought to fruition in some future existence, if by chance they are not matured in the course of the present life. Hence we find the doctrine of Karma inextricably interwoven with that of Re-incarnation.

Actions of the past life, awaiting development as effects, force forward each entity to a fresh in-

carnation. Buddhism teaches that the action of an individual is his possession and inheritance; further, it maintains that his action is not only the womb that bears him but also the race of which he is akin. To state the same idea differently, actions form the soul structure which manifests itself as the formative element that shapes our existence and destiny. Action has many planes, such as the physical, the instinctual, the intellectual, the moral, the spiritual and the like, in which it can inhere and operate. Physical karma will manifest itself in physical tendencies, bringing sensual enjoyments and bodily sufferings. The intellectual and moral planes are likewise the result of past Karmic tendencies. It is thus made possible for the newly incarnated entity, with its moral, intellectual and other equipments, to be in unbroken continuity with its past. After incarnation only that amount of Karmic energy which the entity has at birth manifests itself as the initial Karma. Fresh Karma begins after that period, and the new personality becomes the ruler of his destiny. Out of the present life, Karma causes in this manner new life to flow forth continually in an inexhaustible stream.

The ego's incarnation in physical life being the first great result of Karmic action, the birth-seeking entity, consisting of desires and dispositions, aptitudes and tendencies gained through the struggles of previous existence, presses forward manifestation in bodily form. But since the Ego or the Individuality has no spiritual origin in the parentage in which it seeks its embodiment, it is the dominant affinities which select, when the time is mature for its incarnation, the home that is most congenial for the development of this group of formative faculties. In other words, the incarnation of the Ego takes place in such surroundings as are most in harmony with its Karmic tendencies. Thus it happens that the entity's station in life, its sex, the nature of its physique,—in short, all those conditioning factors of physical existence classified under the terms "heredity" and "national traits" are determined by the effects of actions contained in the Karma. Hence we may even say that it is the child that chooses (of course automatically and unconsciously to himself) not only its parents but also its race and the country of its birth. Thus Karma fulfils itself in the life history of each individual agent, and out of the actions of this life creates, as due reaction, the life that follows, determining not only the occurrence but also the character of the rebirth.

Karma is always changing, and consequently the abode of the Spirit must also keep changing. The Ego therefore is dragged back into earthly life again and again, thus making its long continuance in one existence well-nigh impossible. So long as action is governed by material and selfish motives, just so long must the effect of that action be manifested

in rebirths. All action, no matter on what plane, produces disturbance in the balanced harmony of the universe, and the vibrations so caused roll backwards and forwards until equilibrium is restored. But the restoration of the balance depends on the reconverging of all the forces to the same point whence they started. So it happens that the consequences of a man's deeds re-act upon him with the same force with which he set them in motion. Hence in the moral world, the law of conservation of energy becomes the deed with reward and punishment and the law of rebirth the basis of the most elaborate scheme of moral retribution ever offered to the world. But retribution, as here understood, is not a pure vindictive theory of punishment. Reward and punishment are there for the progressive education of the will. So the law of retribution, not being an end in itself, has its reformative and preventive aspects also.

In the domain of eternal justice sin and its punishment are inseparably connected as the same event because there is no real distinction between the action and its outcome. Reward must follow a good deed and punishment an evil one. One man enjoys wealth and happiness, while another experiences poverty and sorrow. Why is this? Because that is the way the universal law of retributive justice operates; each state is the exact award due for the acts which disturbed or preserved the harmony of nature. Therefore in quality as well as in quantity, life is the accurately meted and altogether fitting expiation of the deeds of a previous existence. But then, is it just to punish an individual for the sins committed in a former birth of which he has no recollection? If there is no memory of past existence, of what value is this scheme of recompense? In reply it may be pointed out that it is far more unjust that a man should bear the penalty of sins committed by his progenitors, sins for which he is in no way responsible, and of which he has no knowledge, than that he should suffer for his own transgressions, even though his memory carries no record of them. As for the value of retribution, it must be noted that since what a man takes over into his next life is not details of memory but character, not knowledge but strength of mind, memory of past experiences is not indispensable. So long as the qualities of the spirit are cultivated, preserved and transmitted from one life to another by the law of moral retribution it must be regarded as both essential and valuable to the evolution of the inner man. As this world is not only a world produced by law, but one that is moved and governed by the operation of natural laws, the law of retribution also works as a law of nature. Therefore punishment suffered is not anything ordered by some Supreme God but the result of the natural operation of the law itself.

In the light of this doctrine

does not man appear as a mere product of nature? Is he not predetermined by the Law of Karma? Though in reality Karma predetermines no one, to many it does appear as a doctrine of Fatalism, pure and simple. Perhaps, Karma's protest against the unscientific view of absolute freedom has also led some to think that it emphasizes iron necessity at the expense of spontaneity or free-will. Much of this confusion will be cleared if Karma is rightly understood. To begin with it must be noted that Karma has a cosmic as well as a psychological aspect. In the former it appears as the universal law of adjustment, in the latter as the principle of ethical causation. Likewise, every deed of the individual produces a twofold effect, the physical and the psychical. The former cannot be changed by the individual however much he may try; but the latter can be controlled by him through self-discipline. Even in Karma itself, Indian thinkers recognize three varieties:—the karmas, which have already begun to take effect in the present life from the deeds of the previous human births, are known as *prarabdha* karmas. But such causes which, though arising out of former existence, are still immature, are called *samçita* or seed-like impressions. And the stock that is now being stored up by actions in this life are classified as *agami* karmas. While karmas of the first group cannot be changed, the two latter ones can be overcome by knowledge. In all these three cases Karma brings about the subjective and objective consequences in relation to which man is free or not-free as the case may be.

It is true that man in this Karmic scheme can neither shirk his responsibility nor have his sins forgiven or blotted out. It is also true that no one but he himself can make atonement for his sins, and that the universal law of cause and effect cannot be set aside in his favour because of his repentance or resolve to live a better life in the future. Karma therefore is fate in the sense that the rewards and punishments of the actions of his former life must be enjoyed or endured, and that his present circumstances are determined by the past. Even here determinism is not of the merely mechanical type, for it (Karma) tells us that there is a continuity between the past and the present. Man is subject to determinism in the real sense only when he is conditioned by external causes. But he is all the time creating his own Karma, and shaping the character of his next birth. And so Karma differs from Fate in that it allows him enough freedom to weave his own future, even though his present is determined by the past. His ruling Destiny, of course, cannot be escaped. Nevertheless, man has power to choose either the external or internal conditions which affect the determination of his will upon his actions. He can either follow the heavenly voice and struggle to overcome his destiny,—even if the fight be in vain,—or else reach that goal as a willing partner, following the voice of the lower self.

In fact, if man utilizes his powers to the best advantage, he can conquer even his Karma. But to bring that about Karma insists on resolute and ceaseless effort. And this certainly is not consistent with a denial of freedom. Karma must not therefore be interpreted as excluding constant spiritual activity. Karma makes man, in all his endeavours, dependent upon no one save himself, and so his destiny evolves even as he himself ordains it. It is he therefore who creates causes, but all that Karma ever does is to adjust the effect. Even where man appears as free to act, he is conditioned by internal causes; only because such causes are a part of his own nature, he appears as a free agent. Absolute freedom as such, unregulated by laws, is unthinkable, and freedom in the human world obtains only within limits. Because man oscillates between matter and spirit, we find him subject to both necessity and freedom. The physical in him brings him under the sway of iron necessity, while that which is divine makes him assert the freedom of his will. Only as it confronts thus the factors of determinism, does freedom itself receive its full content, since destiny and exertion are two aspects of the one great truth. Therefore it is just such an hypothesis, as effectively combines the elements of truth in the theories of Fate and Free Will, which can explain most satisfactorily the place and function of a conscious being in the natural world. And it is most noteworthy that it is only the law of Karma that reconciles, if any theory does, these irreconcilable doctrines.

Actions affect not the agent only but also those about him. In other words, no one can sin, and suffer its effects alone. Since human beings are interdependent, we have not merely individual suffering but collective suffering also. By virtue of this law of interdependence, the aggregate of individual karma gives us what is known as National Karma, and the sum total of National Karma becomes the Karma of the World. That Karma which results from this interdependence is known as Distributive Karma, and it is this law which provides a solution to the social problem of collective suffering and its relief. It is the want of harmony which is responsible for all pain and misery among the masses, and this, in turn, is due to the disturbance in the equilibrium caused by individual and national selfishness. Slums and red light districts, class and caste distinctions, sexes and their distinctive functions in the affairs of life, labour and capital and their unequal distribution,—all these and the numerous other items of social mal-adjustment are the effects of Karma. How can such sorrow and suffering be eliminated? That which causes untold misery by making us mistake the false for the true, and the true for the false is ignorance. It

binds man to Karma, but knowledge, by dispelling this illusion, sets him free; it leads him further to the attainment of Arhatship or Sainthood, thus rendering him immune from rebirth in the realm of Desire of Form and of Formlessness. Individual suffering can be overcome therefore only by seeking the fruits of the Noble Path of the soul. Inasmuch as each man, who rises to a higher state of soul life, lifts, be it ever so little, the whole body of which he is an integral part, this terrible problem of collective suffering can also be solved only when every individual, having had his spiritual intuition fully opened, has contributed to the general welfare what he could of money, of service and of ennobling ideas and ideals. Only in this way can the broken harmony be re-established, and the balance of National Karma be struck.

In conclusion, we may say that a belief in Karma is of great practical value. By bringing home to man the truth that his happiness or misery,—instead of being the award of an iron-willed or capricious God, or the decree of an inflexible Fate, or even the outcome of Blind Chance,—is entirely the result of whatever he has formerly done himself, Karma strengthens the idea of moral responsibility. Such a conception makes us not only to submit in meek resignation to whatever befalls us in this life but so to live as to avoid a similar fate in the next life, and to work with hope and confidence since the making of the future is still in our power. Further, it helps us to realize that the calamities and inequalities of life, instead of being something mysterious, are but the mere consequences of our previous deeds. And what is more, as a rational solution to the perplexing problem of good and evil it reconciles man to the heart-rending injustices of life. Though many may maintain that Karma, like other theories in religion and ethics, has its own faults and shortcomings, yet in the soundness of its basis and the iron logic of its structure, the doctrine of Karma is colossal and penetrating. Unlike the law of causation as understood in the West, the Law of Karma, as the Regulative Principle of the Universe, operates as effectively in the world of man as it does in the world of Nature. A study of this theory, without prejudice of birth or of early training, may help Western scholars to find that very formula for which they are now in search.

JAGADISAN M. KUMARAPPA

THE THRILL PSYCHOSIS

[**Charles Dernier** is a keen business-man of Petersburg, U. S. A. whose ideals "have proven to be not only a solace but a stimulant in these very hard times". In the following article he writes not of economic depression but about "immorality—extravagance and licence—to which no one seems to be paying serious attention. . . . the press is busy in providing thrills and excuses for thrills".

This article was on its way to us when Professor Wadia was preparing his on "India and Objective Reality" which appeared in our last issue; but this might well be taken as a rejoinder to that article. The striking fact which Mr. Dernier emphasises is the general and widespread prevalence of vice—"the dare-devil catch-phrase 'I'll try anything once!' which has swept U. S. A. like wild fire, must be charged with the first steps of many off the path of rectitude". Indian publicists have a message in this article, as Indian business-men had theirs in Mr. Dernier's "Ideals in Business" which appeared in THE ARYAN PATH for July 1931.—EDS.]

The abnormal craving for thrills, for getting, as it is vulgarly expressed in America, "a kick" out of this or that experience, lies at the root of many of the least desirable recent developments in Western civilization. The appetite for thrills grows by what it feeds on. Excitement is a powerful stimulant. It gives a fillip to jaded nerves and seems to help its addicts to sustain the high tempo of twentieth-century civilization in the West. It affects the emotional nature as narcotics do the physical body. Indulgence creates the thirst for more, while the victim of the thrill psychosis becomes increasingly dependent on the stimulant, until he regards excitement as not only natural but well-nigh indispensable to his very existence. It is a phase of the feverish restlessness of the West, one symptom of the nervous tension under which we live, which is reflected also in the increasing number of marriages that terminate in the divorce court, in the "crime waves," and in the growing populations of our institutions for the insane.

It is but natural, we shall be told, that wage toilers in the machine age should turn to stimuli of senses and emotions for relief from the monotony of their occupations. No one can doubt the desirability of occasional or periodic recreation to relieve the strain of work-a-day existence, but how much of the entertainment and diversion of the present day fulfils the purpose of re-creating those who indulge in them?

We pride ourselves, in most Western countries, on being too civilized to permit the cruelty of bull fights, but the providing of thrills, vicarious or personal, is no less the aim of the brutalizing prize fight, the hunting down of animals in the name of sport, the circus, where human lives are risked and sometimes lost in reckless feats to make the on-

lookers' hearts beat faster, and the cheap amusement park, where thrills on roller coaster and Ferris wheel are offered at first hand.

The culmination of absurdity in the quest of thrills has been reached in the plague of endurance contests from which America has suffered in the last several years. Permanent injury to health has been risked by contestants in the effort to set meaningless records for everything from pole-sitting to "Marathon dancing" in which grace and rhythm are disregarded, all that counts being the length of time exhausted dancers can keep their weary feet shuffling.

Misguided parents pander to the thrill psychosis by giving toy guns to their young sons. The cities in the United States are overrun with youthful bandits, ordering their playmates to "Stick 'em up!" The other day I saw a small boy playing by himself, lunging about him at imaginary foes in a frenzy of murderous fury that made my blood run cold. People with pacifist leanings have been wont to deplore children's drilling and playing soldiers as tending to foster a militaristic spirit, but how much worse to have them playing hold-up men and kidnappers! We lament the prevalence of crime to-day and we do well to lament it, but what of the future when these children, whose repugnance to crime has thus been broken down, shall come to maturity, and what of the responsibility of those who have condoned if not encouraged their subversive sport?

But, however great the contribution of such sensational diversions to emotional strain, they are less harmful than the more subtle thrills offered by the average cinema show with its sex appeal, by the highly emotional combinations of sounds that currently pass for music, and by newspaper accounts of atrocities. The press plays a not inconsiderable part in polluting the race mind and undermining morals through the unwholesome prominence it gives to crime stories and the gusto with which unsavory details are narrated without regard even to the obvious danger of inciting immature minds to imitation. Motion pictures, radio, and the press have tremendous educational and cultural possibilities, but in large measure these are being ignored in favour of supplying what the artificially stimulated appetite of the public demands. Practically all of our commercialized diversions exalt the emotions at the expense of the reasoning faculties, while the higher nature of man is on slim rations indeed.

In the United States, prohibition legislation invested with a thrill the sordidness of drinking intoxicants. The consciousness of defying the law lent zest to the home manufacture and consumption of unpalatable or noxious brews. Attending a social function under the influence of liquor, or having to be assisted home afterward, ceased to be looked upon as a disgrace in many circles. The hip flask

became the badge of sophistication and *savoir faire* among all too many of the rising generation.

It was practically inevitable that this lowering of standards of conduct in one direction should have been paralleled by a distressing increase in promiscuous sex relations among adolescents—the same quest of a thrill at the root of both aberrations. Whether or not a sentence can be as potent for evil as the Hindu Mantras, properly intoned, are held to be for good, there is little doubt that the dare-devil catch phrase, "I'll try anything once!" which has swept U. S. A. like wild-fire, must be charged with the first steps of many off the path of rectitude.

The sometimes well-meaning but always short-sighted advocates of birth control by artificial means are no less victims of the thrill psychosis. They overlook or underestimate the moral value of self-discipline through sex-control and devote their efforts to spreading information on how to evade the natural consequences of self-indulgence. So deeply has the virus penetrated society that we recently had the startling spectacle of the majority of the Committee on Marriage and the Home of what is probably the greatest interdenominational Protestant organization in the New World going on record as favouring this abomination.*

Gambling always has offered relief from the monotony of existence. Betting probably never has been confined to the races, but it has remained for our modern Western civilization to invest it with the dignity of a profession. The wide appeal of the thrill of dabbling in stocks contributed largely to the spectacular rise in fictitious values which preceded the stock market debacle of 1929, from the effects of which the world has not yet recovered.

There is nothing constructive in a thrill. Whatever of good may come of it, as, for example, greater knowledge of aeronautics out of airplane stunting, is quite incidental and the cost of the by-product is too high. The resolve to lead a better and nobler life is commendable, even when it is publicly made, in the emotional transports of an evangelistic revival, but how much greater power and duration may be expected from a vow taken by a man alone, in silent communion with his own higher nature!

The very antithesis of the quest of the average man in the West for thrills is the aim of steadiness, equilibrium, balance, control of the emotions, which has ever been the ideal of the thoughtful in every land, as it is that of the masses in the quiet and contemplative East.

CHARLES DERNIER

* Majority Report, Committee on Marriage and the Home, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, issued March 21, 1931.

THE RELIGION OF WILLIAM BLAKE

[**John Middleton Murry** wrote on "The Vision of John Keats" in our July issue. The following article is replete with Theosophical teachings especially about Christ and Satan to be found in the Second Volume of *The Secret Doctrine.* —EDS.].

With William Blake, we must take a plunge: the quicker the better. So I take the plunge from his four most famous lines. They have for their title—and their title is important—"Auguries of Innocence".

To see a World in a grain of sand
And a Heaven in a wild flower
Hold Infinity in the palm of your hand
And Eternity in an hour.

The lines are familiar, even fashionable. But how on earth does one see 'a World in a grain of sand?'

The problem is simple. Is Blake asking us to see something that is in a grain of sand or something that is not in it? The answer to the problem is equally simple, and emphatic. We are required to see something that actually is in a grain of sand.

Blake would have agreed that it did not always happen. There were plenty of days when he could not see it himself. For instance,

When you are under the dominion of a jealous Female
Unpermanent for ever because of Love and Jealousy
You shall want all the Minute Particulars of Life.

"Minute Particulars." Blake was very keen about them above all at the time—in his old age—when he was composing "Jerusalem," from which these words are taken. 'Minute Particulars.' Change but a syllable, and you have "minute particles"—almost exactly "grains of sand".

There is no deception. Blake himself shall speak—from 'Jerusalem' again: page 31. Los, who is the Imagination, looks upon the Fallen Man, Albion. Los and Albion are not two persons. They are the regenerative and unregenerated parts of the one Universal Man. Los explores the fallen Man of whom he is himself the imaginative part.

Los took his globe of fire to search the interiors of Albion's
Bosom, in all the Terrors of friendship entering the caves . . .
And saw every Minute Particular of Albion degraded and murdered
But saw not by whom; they were hidden within in the minute particulars
Of which they had possessed Themselves . . But Los
Search'd in vain; closed from the minutia, he walked difficult.

Imagination finds the going hard except through the Minute Particulars, and these have been possessed and degraded and murdered by an unknown power. Now remember that Albion—the Eternal Man in his fallen state—is also England: not really England, but England serves as a symbol to articulate The Fallen Man. So

Los came down from Highgate through Hackney and Holloway towards London
Till he came to old Stratford and thence to Stepney and the isle
Of Leutha's dogs, thence through the narrows of the River's side
And saw every minute particular: the jewels of Albion running down

The kennels of the streets and lanes as if they were abhorr'd
Every Universal Form was become barren mountains of moral
Virtue, and every Minute Particular harden'd into grains of sand
And all the tendernesses of the soul cast forth as filth and mire.

The immediate point of my quotation is to show in what, for Blake, the fall of the Fallen Man consists: first, in his Universal Forms becoming barren mountains of moral virtue; and second in "his Minute Particulars hardening into grains of sand". This was the fall of the Fallen Man.

The Fall consists in the Minute Particulars being hardened, by some malignant agency, into grains of sand. So we have a clue, at least, to the real meaning of the first Augury of Innocence.

To see a World in a grain of sand.

This is the Redemption: the changing back of the grain of sand into the Minute Particular which it really is. When that happens we have the first Augury of Innocence. So we begin to see why the word *Augury* is used; it is a harbinger of Innocence to come. And that is very important. Blake is not speaking as he is almost always supposed to be speaking, of the actual innocence of the child in these famous lines; he is speaking of the regained Innocence of the Fallen Man. He is saying: "When you can see a world in a grain of sand—the world that is actually in it; when you can see a heaven in a wild flower—the heaven that is actually there to see—then you know that your Redemption is nigh. You are regaining Innocence." And as we could have corroborated the heaven in a wild flower by "Behold the lilies of the field"—so we corroborate the meaning of Auguries of Innocence by "Except ye become as little children ye shall in no wise enter the Kingdom of Heaven". Of course, Jesus, like Blake, was talking to grown men. He was speaking of a second Innocence: a redemption of the Fallen Man. And of course, like Blake, he was speaking of it as something which happens here and now—not at some far-off time, in some far-off Kingdom—but now, at this moment, here.

And Blake's final symbolism for this redemption from the Fall, this rebirth into Innocence, is intimately connected with his vision of Minute Particulars. For him the Fall of Man consists in his losing this vision of the Minute Particulars; the Redemption consists in his regaining the vision. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that this is the total message of Blake. He enforces it through a thousand forms of recondite imagery, but it all comes back to this simple and mysterious happening.

Now when Blake says that the Fall of Man consists in his losing the vision of the Minute Particulars, does he mean that Man has actually *lost* that vision? Does he mean that at some time in his actual life Man possessed that vision, and now it is gone? The answer is "Yes," and "No". And that is the true answer, which distinguishes Blake, like Keats from Wordsworth, for whom the

vision splendid fades as we enter further into the life of the world, and can only be recaptured in fitful evanescent moments. But Wordsworth could never rid himself of the thought of Annette, or overcome his own sense of sin. He could not attain, as Blake did, that level of experience from which a man can see his past with naked eyes and accept it and know *all* experience as good; that spiritual condition in which even one's own Minute Particulars can be known and loved.

For the doctrine of Minute Particulars applies not merely to the world out there—the objective world—but to the world in here—the subjective world. We have to be able to see a world in *our* grains of sand—the separate experiences of our lives. And that is the meaning of Blake's words in the passage I have quoted:—

Every Universal Form was become barren mountains of moral virtue
And every Minute Particular harden'd into grains of sand
And all the tendernesses of the soul cast forth as filth and mire.

"All the tendernesses of the soul cast forth as filth and mire."—that is what Blake would have said to Wordsworth striving to cast the memory of Annette, as a foul thing, from his soul.

Blake's religion of the Minute Particulars is a terribly subversive religion. It takes us clean beyond "good and evil"; it is indeed aimed directly against the religion of "good and evil". It begins indeed, in Blake's own words, "with a marriage of Heaven and Hell". At the moment when that great discovery fell upon him, and his eyes were opened, he did what Nietzsche did at a like moment, he nakedly proclaimed an absolute reversal of values.

Without Contraries is no progression. Attraction and
Repulsion, Reason and Energy, Love and Hate, are necessary to Human existence.
From these contraries spring what the religions call
Good and Evil.
Good is the passive that obeys Reason. Evil is the active springing from Energy.

And again:

The reason Milton wrote in fetters when he wrote of
Angels and God, and at liberty when he wrote of Devils and Hell, is because he was a true Poet and of the
Devil's party without knowing it.

So, the true Poet—which is Blake's name for the man of creative genius—is necessarily "evil," what Goethe called the "dæmonic" man. Thus, to take the instance which was of decisive importance to Blake himself—the instance of Jesus—the last thing it is generally desired to remember about him was what a profoundly revolutionary spirit he was. He was, within the most completely religious society in the world in his life-time, a complete rebel: a complete criminal. That, we say to ourselves, or others say to us, is because the Jews were an evil and adulterous generation, which is, of course, ridiculous nonsense. In point of fact, the Jews of his day were a more religious society than we English are.

In what did the rebellion—the creative newness—of Jesus consist? Blake was quite clear in his own mind about this: it is the theme of "The Everlasting Gospel".

If moral virtue was Christianity
Christ's pretensions were all vanity;

And Caiaphas and Pilate men
Praiseworthy . . . .

That is how it begins. And if this is true, it follows that the Churches have turned Christianity into the very thing which Jesus fought. And that was Blake's conviction. He came to be absolutely convinced that he understood the true teaching of Jesus, and the moment he was convinced of that, he absolutely devoted himself, body and soul, to propagating the true gospel. Unless this be grasped, the whole of "Milton," the whole of "Jerusalem," all the lovely visions of the Book of Job, will be meaningless.

It is remarkable that there are no less than six substantial versions of "The Everlasting Gospel". I don't suppose Blake was satisfied with any of them. Perhaps he was attempting the impossible—to give a complete description of the Jesus who was real to him. The two things he wishes to stress are perfectly clear: The first of them is this: that Jesus was a rebel—that he was imbued not with the Reason that is Good, but with the Energy that is Evil.

Was Jesus born of a Virgin pure
With narrow soul and looks demure?
If He intended to take on Sin
The Mother should an harlot been . . .
Or what was it which He took on
That He might bring salvation?
A Body subject to be tempted
From neither pain nor grief exempted?
Or such a body as might not feel
The passions that with sinners deal?
Yes, but they say He never fell.
Ask Caiaphas, for he can tell.

Caiaphas speaks:

He mock'd the Sabbath, and He mock'd
The Sabbath's God, and He unlock'd
The evil spirits from their shrines
And turn'd Fishermen to divines;
O'erturned the tent of secret sins
And its Golden cords and pins . . .
"Obey your parents!"—What says He?
"Woman, what have I to do with thee?
No earthly parents I, confess:
I am doing My Father's business."
He scorn'd Earth's parents, scorned Earth's God,
And mock'd the one and the other's Rod;
His seventy Disciples sent
Against Religion and Government . . .
He left His Father's trade to roam
A wand'ring vagrant without home;
And thus He others' labour stole
That He might live above control.
The publicans and harlots He
Selected for His company,
And from the Adulteress turn'd away
God's righteous law, that lost its prey.

But the supreme offence—this is the second of the two points which is stressed in every version of "The Everlasting Gospel"—is that Jesus utterly abolished the Law.

The Moral Virtues in their pride
Did o'er the world triumphant ride
In Wars and Sacrifice for sin,
And souls to Hell ran trooping in . . .
The Accuser, Holy God of All
This Pharisaic Worldly Ball
Amidst them in his Glory Beams
Upon the Rivers and the Streams
Then Jesus rose and said to me:
"Thy Sins are all forgiven Thee"
Loud Pilate Howl'd, loud Caiaphas yell'd
When they the Gospel Light beheld.
It was when Jesus said to me
"Thy sins are all forgiven Thee."

That sounds innocuous, and almost Orthodox. But Blake happens to be speaking not of something which happened long ago, or something which will happen hereafter. He is speaking of the here and now—of "all *This* Pharisaic Wordly Ball," where Moral Virtue and the Law reign supreme. And what is more, he is identifying himself with Jesus. Pilate and Caiphas are *his* judges; Satan, the great Accuser, is the Holy God.

Who then is the Jesus who

acquits Blake, accused by the Christian God of moral virtue, who is Satan? If Blake has identified himself with Jesus, who is the Jesus who declares that his sins are forgiven? The answer is the inevitable one. It is Blake himself. But not Blake in his own ego. For it is not merely presumption, but a downright spiritual impossibility for a man in his own ego to forgive himself. It is the Eternal Man in Blake himself who forgives his own sins—and Blake's name for this Eternal Man, in himself and other men, is Jesus.

But far more important to Blake, as it was probably far more important to Jesus himself, was the fact that this Eternal Man was Everyman. He was, so to speak, a condition that every man could attain to—the condition wherein, in Tchehov's words, "all things are forgiven, and it would be strange not to forgive". And this condition is an impersonal condition. Jesus himself never said "I forgive you"; he said: "You are forgiven." For the profound and simple fact is that "forgiveness" is not of the ego, not of the self, at all. Where the condition of "forgiveness" is, there the ego is not. And this profound and simple fact is the reason why Jesus, who discovered this condition of "forgiveness" in himself, or rather through himself, was compelled to attribute it to God. For Jesus, this condition *was* God.

Now, manifestly, if the condition of "forgiveness," the condition of the Eternal Man, is one which negates the condition of the "ego," then it follows that the way to achieve it is by an annihilation of the "ego," or the self, as Blake calls it. The self is the home of Good and Evil; it is that which makes judgments of Good and Evil. And Blake's particular name for the self is the Spectre—he calls it the Spectre because the act of judgment is deadly and because it can be exorcised, made to vanish away; because the act of judgment is only a Negation. It denies this, as evil, and asserts that, as good. Now perhaps we can understand what Blake is trying to say in "Milton" (p. 46).

All that can be annihilated must be annihilated
That the Children of Jerusalem may be redeemed from slavery.
There is a Negation, and there is a Contrary:
The Negation must be destroy'd to redeem the Contraries.
The Negation is the Spectre, the Reasoning Power in Man:
This is a false body, an Incrustation over my Immortal
Spirit, a Selfhood which must be put off and annihilated always.
To cleanse the Face of my Spirit by self-examination
To bathe in the waters of Life, to wash off the Not Human,
I come in Self-annihilation and the grandeur of Inspiration.

It is nominally Milton who speaks; but it is Milton's spirit which has descended from Eternity and entered into Blake. As a matter of fact, it is simply the Eternal Man who is speaking. Blake has created this Milton: he has, by his own participation in the Eternal Man, "redeemed" Milton.

The Contraries are Good and Evil, and the Negation is that which judges them as Good and Evil. Annihilate the Negation, and the Contraries are "redeemed". Good and Evil become both positive, in the sense that "Without Contraries there is no Progression"—no Life. Good and Evil, and the Negation (or the Spectre) which maintains them in that deadly fixation:—these constitute the threefold, or Sexual, Man. And, as Blake says on the 4th page of Milton, "The Sexual is Threefold, the Human is Fourfold". And the Human is Fourfold, because it has become the home of the Eternal Man, who is born first by the annihilation of the Spectre, and the consequent redemption of the Contraries. When the Contraries are redeemed, the Spectre which has been annihilated is also redeemed, and once redeemed, there is no longer any harm in it, for it is recognised simply as an inevitable and necessary condition of existence in time. Though annihilated, it still exists, and the Eternal Man serenely acknowledges and accepts it.

But, as Goethe said, we conquer our eternity from day to day, and the mere fact that we must live in a world of Good and Evil, where incessant judgments of Good and Evil are a condition of life, makes it necessary that the fourfold Human should ever be on his guard against any partial "incrustation of the Immortal Spirit by the False Body of the Selfhood". This is what Blake means when he says that this False Body of the Selfhood "must be put off and annihilated *alway*". No *real* relapse into the Threefold Sexual is ever again possible, once the Spectre has been annihilated, and restored by the Spirit into a disciplined and harmonious existence: nevertheless the supremacy of the Spirit has to be asserted continuously in life, paradoxical though that may sound. And this conflict in time between the Threefold Sexual and the Fourfold Human, this usurpation of the place of the Spirit by the Spectre, is precisely the happening in which, for Blake, consists the Fall of Man regarded as an eternal event. In his symbolism, Urthona is Spirit, Urizen the Spectre or Reason; and the rebellion of Urizen against Urthona and the usurpation of Urthona's rightful throne by Urizen, is the great drama of the soul to which Blake in his prophetic books constantly returns. Thus the Fall of Man consists in the disruption of the fourfold Human, and the consequent degeneration into the threefold Sexual. The Negation is established, and the Contraries become sterile opposites. This, in Blake's view, is the condition of human beings until they are regenerated.

But—this is important—this Fall of Man is not an event in time. As far as I can see, Blake did not at any time really believe that the individual had been fourfold and Human, and had fallen—whether at birth, or at the end of age of childish innocence—into the threefold sexual. In other words, the regeneration of the

threefold into the fourfold Man was not a return to any former condition, it was the achievement of a creatively new condition. But this condition was so manifestly the goal of human life, that it seemed to Blake that it must be the essence, the fundamental reality of human life. As essence, it was eternal. Therefore it could be symbolically represented as the condition from which Man fell.

This brings us, hard and sharp, against the mystery of the relation of Eternity to Time. And also, I am glad to say, it brings us up against it from the right direction—from the only direction in which the mystery of Time and Eternity appears the pregnant mystery it veritably is and not a barren intellectual paradox. Actual experience is the only solution of that mystery; and to actual experience it simply ceases to be mysterious. Any one who knows at first hand the condition of the Fourfold Human is perfectly clear about the relation between Time and Eternity; and no one else can be. Such a man will know without my telling him that Eternity is in the here and now: and he will also know that since it is always the discovery of an individual experience, there are as many ways of expressing it as there are people who discover it. Thus, when Blake says, simply and beautifully "Eternity is in love with the productions of Time," he is saying precisely what Spinoza said with equal simplicity and beauty when he said that *sub specie aeternitatis omnis existentia est perfectio*; or again precisely what Keats said:

Beauty is Truth, Truth Beauty, that is all
Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.

JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY

Do not believe that lust can ever be killed out if gratified or satiated, for this is an abomination inspired by Mara. It is by feeding vice that it expands and waxes strong, like to the worm that fattens on the blossom's heart.

The rose must re-become the bud, born of its parent stem before the parasite has eaten through its heart and drunk its life-sap.

The golden tree puts forth its jewel-buds before its trunk is withered by the storm.

The pupil must regain *the child-state he has lost* ere the first sound can fall upon his ear.

The light from the ONE MASTER the one unfading golden light of Spirit, shoots its effulgent beams on the Disciple from the very first. Its rays thread through the thick, dark clouds of matter.

Now here, now there, these rays illumine it, like sun-sparks light the earth through the thick foliage of the jungle growth. But, O Disciple, unless the flesh is passive, head cool, the Soul as firm and pure as flaming diamond, the radiance will not reach the *chamber*, its sunlight will not warm the heart, nor will the mystic sounds of the Akasic heights reach the ear, however eager, at the initial stage.

—*The Voice of the Silence*

ALCHEMY IN CHINA*

[**Dr. E. J. Holmyard, M.A., M. Sc.,** is a scientist, who unlike most of his compeers has not neglected the search for the knowledge which the old-world possessed, and which is now lost; nor has he hesitated studying and expounding a subject like alchemy which is taboo to the ordinary scientist, for, a belief in it has been regarded as superstition.

In this article Dr. Holmyard reviews the history of alchemy in China. The fascinating story on pp. 747-8 raises the old interesting query—how far have teachers of soul-science, who were also adepts in alchemy, used alchemical terms and processes in a symbolic way? To transmute the lead of passion (kama) into the pure yellow metal of intuition (buddhi) has been a theosophic expression in use for centuries; and there are others. The Sanskrit word for metal is *dhatu* (धातु:) and it also means elementary constituents of the body; and more, the same word, as a suffix, occurs in *Mano-dhatu*, Mind-metal, *Kama-dhatu*, Feeling-metal, etc. Again, the human body is supposed to consist of 84,000 dhatus, and Emperor Asoka is said to have built 84,000 *dhatu-gopas* or *dagobas*, in honour of every cell of the Buddha's body, each of which has now become a *Dharma-dhatu* or Holy Relic. These *dagobas*, moreover, show that their original builders regarded them as symbolical of the human body.

We hope that some Indian scientist-scholar will work on the hint given in the closing sentence of this essay, and search for those MSS. in this ancient land.
—EDS.]

"Transmutation is a natural phenomenon of the universe. Why, then, should there be any suspicion that gold and silver may not be made from other substances?" Such was the question put to sceptics by the celebrated Taoist philosopher Ko-Hung, nicknamed Pao Pu Tzu or "Old Sober-Sides," who wrote on philosophy and alchemy in the fourth century of our era. The fact that, even at this early date, there were men in China who doubted the possibility of metallic transmutation, would seem to prove that alchemy was already well established in that country; for, if we may argue from the course of events in other regions, unbelief in alchemical pretensions never arose until some considerable time after the appearance of the Divine Art. Native authors, indeed, ascribe a high antiquity to Chinese alchemy, a claim that, if substantiated, would render it possible (perhaps even probable) that the alchemical lore of Alexandria, Islam and Latin Christendom was originally derived—as so much else was certainly derived—from

*Authorities:—

Dr. O. S. Johnson: *A Study of Chinese Alchemy*. Shanghai, 1928.

Prof. T. L. Davis and Dr. Lu-Ch'iang Wu: "The advice of Wei Po-Yang to the Worker in Alchemy" (*The Nucleus*, March, 1931); "The Pill of Immortality" (*The Technology Review*, XXXIII, No. 8, May, 1931; "Chinese Alchemy" (*The Scientific Monthly*, XXXI, 225-235, 1930).

Principal H. E. Stapleton and Dr. R. F. Azo: "Chemistry in Iraq and Persia in the Tenth Century A. D." (*Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, VIII, 317-418, 1927).

the enigmatical Celestial Empire.

Until the last decade or so, the problem of alchemy in China had received but little attention from historians of science, partly, no doubt, on account of the inherent difficulties of the subject, and partly from the fact that few scholars interested in the development of science were adequately versed in classical Chinese. On the other hand, few competent sinologists knew anything of alchemy. The inevitable result of such regrettable ignorance was that the Chinese were either credited with discoveries that, even on general grounds, it was extremely unlikely that they ever made, or equally without foundation accused of plagiarism, falsification of records, and bodily appropriation of Western, Indian or Muslim ideas afterwards alleged to be indigenous.

With a rapidly increasing realization that a knowledge of the development of science is of vital importance in modern culture, the desirability of filling so serious a lacuna has happily been perceived, and several scholars—notably Tenney L. Davis, Lu'Ch'iang Wu, Obed S. Johnson, H. E. Stapleton and R. F. Azo—have already placed the matter upon a much more satisfactory footing. While there is still very much to be done—indeed, the investigation is yet in its initial stages—a great deal of first-hand information has been obtained, and some of the principal features of the territory have been clearly discerned. As most students of the occult would have anticipated, the results are of considerable interest and of at least equal significance.

The most striking fact about Chinese alchemy that emerges from the recent work upon the subject is its extreme age. Western alchemy appears to have originated among the Alexandrian Greeks of the second and third centuries A. D., but, if the records are to be trusted, Chinese alchemy was by this time already several centuries old. In the *Shih Chi* ("Historical Memoirs" of Ssu Ma Ch'ien, who wrote in 116 B. C., it is related that in 221 B. C. the adept Hsu Shih led several thousand young men and women on an expedition to discover three mountains or islands, P'eng lai, Fang Chan and Yin Chou, upon which was to be obtained the drug to compound the Elixir of Life. One of the principal objects of alchemy was thus deliberately sought by the Chinese four or five hundred years before Zosimos the Panopolitan wrote some of the first Greek alchemical treatises.

In the following century, the alchemist Li Shao Chun informed the Emperor Wu Ti (156-87 B. C.) that cinnabar may be transformed into yellow gold by the sacrifice of the furnace. Were such gold converted into cups for drinking and platters for eating, he who ate and drank therefrom would find his life prolonged; and if he employed this longevity to visit the immortals upon P'eng lai he might himself attain to immortality. Entranced by this seductive vision, Wu Ti performed in person the sacrifices of the furnace, and busied himself in chemical experiments with cinnabar and a great variety of other substances. The chronicler adds, however, that although much money was spent, the Emperor did not succeed in finding the immortals and immortality. This lack of success did not deter a prince of Huai Nan, named Liu An, from enthusiastic search for the secrets of immortality and transmutation. Writing in the latter half of the second century B. C., he asserted that gold slowly grows in the earth by a natural process, and that it is evolved from the immaterial principle underlying the universe, passing from one form to another up to silver and then from silver to gold. This idea became a commonplace among the medieval alchemists of Islam and Europe, and was perhaps one of the most long-lived of all alchemical tenets. Abu'l-Qasim al-'Iraqi, for example, who flourished at Cairo about 1260 A. D., says that the prime matter of metals is one, and that it reaches its limit of perfection by natural degrees—from the "unripe" or base metals, such as lead, to the "riper" silver and finally the perfect gold. Geber thought that the formation of gold, by natural processes, required from one thousand to ten thousand years. The Chinese estimate was nearer the lower of these two limits: native cinnabar, at the end of three hundred years, becomes lead; after two hundred years, the lead is transformed into silver; lastly, when two hundred further years have elapsed, the silver is transformed by the Grand Harmony of the universe into purest gold. It is not without interest that a series of transmutations of the elements—uranium to ionium, ionium to radium, radium to radon, radon to polonium and polonium to lead—is actually taking place in Nature; though modern chemistry can find no evidence to show that gold or silver may be in course of production by analogous changes.

The oldest book in the Chinese language wholly devoted to the subject of alchemy is the *Ts'an T'ung Ch'i* (Akinness of the Three), which is said to have been composed about 142 A. D., by the "Father of Alchemy" Wei Po-Yang. The authorities are almost unanimous in regarding this book as authentic and its author as an historical personage, though it is only right to say that some scholars maintain Wei Po-Yang to have been a purely legendary figure and assert that no more is known with certainty of the date of the *Ts'an T'ung Ch'i* than that it belongs to the first millennium after Christ. According to the usually accepted tradition, Wei Po-Yang was a native of Wu, in the modern province of Kiangsu. He was an alchemist, and a philosopher of the Taoist school; he had no love for the things of this world, but preferred to spend his life in a secluded valley where he could

find simplicity, quiet, peace and leisure for reflection. A time at length arrived when he undertook the preparation of the Pill of Immortality. Accompanied by three disciples (of the faith of two of whom he had private doubts) he went into the mountains and began the necessary chemical operations. What exotic drugs were employed in compounding the precious medicine we can, alas, no longer ascertain; but the White Tiger, the Blue Dragon, the Flowing Pearl and the Red Bird were among them, while the Ting or furnace was the principal piece of apparatus. After much anxious care and skilful manipulation, the Pill of Immortality was at last complete. Now Wei Po-Yang had brought with him to the mountains a white dog, and to test his disciples' faith he spoke to them as follows: "We should first assure ourselves that the medicine has been properly prepared by administering a little of it to the dog. If the dog dies we ought not ourselves to take the Pill, but if no harm befalls it we shall know that the medicine is efficacious." This he said, knowing that the first effect of the medicine was to cause a temporary state resembling death. Wei Po-Yang then gave the dog a portion of the Pill, and the animal immediately collapsed and apparently died. "The medicine is not yet complete," said the alchemist, "but since I should be ashamed to return without success, I must myself take it." With this, he swallowed the Pill and died. The three disciples stood aghast, but one of them, with great faith, refused to believe that his master had so behaved without deliberate intention, and followed the example thus awfully set him; he too expired. The other two disciples, with much common sense but little courage, remarked to one another that it would be better to live a few years longer without the Pill of Immortality than to take it and die an instantaneous death. They therefore departed from the mountain to make arrangements for the double funeral. Soon after they had gone, Wei Po-Yang revived, and, by the administration of a little more of the medicine, was able to revive both his disciple and the dog. All three had attained immortality. They went their way, but Wei Po-Yang was courteous enough to send a letter of thanks to the two unbelieving disciples, by a woodman they chanced to meet. "The disciples," naïvely adds the chronicle, "were filled with regrets when they read the letter."

It is characteristic of early Chinese alchemy that the stress is laid rather upon the Elixir of Life or the Pill of Immortality than upon the Elixir of Transmutation. We may surmise that the reason lies in the fact that, until a comparatively late period, gold was not especially prized by the Chinese, even though they regarded it as the perfect metal. It was only through contact with foreign civilizations that gold finally acquired the factitious value that is

one of the most remarkable psychological phenomena the world has ever experienced. "Longevity" says Wei Po-Yang in the *Ts'an T'ung Ch'i*, "is of primary importance in the great triumph." The non-corrodibility of gold rendered it one of the most precious of substances for purposes of compounding the elixir, but there was scarcely any need to resort to transmutation processes in a country so naturally rich in gold as China. Yet the artificial production gold seems to have been attempted (as we have already seen) as early as the days of the Emperor Wu Ti, and, though it is always relegated to a subordinate position, the technique of transmutation is a constant feature of Chinese alchemy.

The chief exponent of the Art in the fourth century A. D.,—the period when Alexandrian alchemy was at its zenith,—was Ko-Hung, a native of Chiang-ning Fu in Kiangsu. He is stated to have lived from approximately 281 to 361, and is well-known as the author of important works on medicine, magic, alchemy and Taoist philosophy. The treatise that he wrote under the pseudonym of Pao Pu Tzu appeared in 330 A. D., but has not hitherto been translated, in its entirety, into any European language. In the fourth, eleventh and sixteenth sections of *Nuy Pe'en* or "Inner Chapters" of this work, Ko-Hung describes methods of making the Yellow (or gold) and White (or silver) Elixirs, and mentions the curious tenet that a man may prolong his life by taking medicines made from plants, but can only "lose his shadow" and become immortal by the use of the Divine Elixir made from minerals and metals. It was, however, necessary to carry out the preparation of this Elixir upon a mountain, in a lonely spot, only two or three being present. There should be fasting for one hundred days previously, and perfect purification of the body. The participants should all be believers in the doctrine (*i. e.* the doctrine of Taoism); and persons who might be likely to ridicule the undertaking should be kept in ignorance of it, otherwise the preparation of the elixir would fail. As to the drugs to be employed, many of the Chinese terms used to describe them have not yet been identified, but the following substances were certainly included: red and yellow sulphides of arsenic (*i. e.*, realgar and orpiment), sulphur, cinnabar, alum, salt, a blue mineral (possibly lapis lazuli or blue vitriol), white arsenic, oyster shells, mica, chalk and the resin of the pine tree. The resulting Elixir, when thrown on to mercury, or a mixture of lead and tin in an iron pot, converted the metal into gold or silver. Taken as a medicine for one hundred days, it made a man immortal, and conferred upon him freedom from all disease and the power of passing unscathed through fire and water.

A major problem for the future is to gauge the relationship of Chinese alchemy with that of Alexandria, Islam and Western Europe. That there are striking similari-

ties is obvious upon even a casual glance, but whether these similarities are due to coincidence or to direct affiliation is a mystery that has yet to be solved. The Alexandrian chemists considered that the transmutation of metals was accompanied, if not occasioned, by transmutation of colour, and the same idea persists in the treatises of Muslim chemists and of their European followers. It is therefore worthy of note that Ko-Hung has the same conceit. "Whiteness," he says, "is the property of lead. But if you cause it to become red, the lead will change into cinnabar. Redness is the property of cinnabar. But if you cause cinnabar to become white, it will change into lead". The exhortations to the disciple to lead an austere life, and to refrain from divulging the secrets of alchemy to the vulgar; the insistence upon the importance of mercury, lead and gold in compounding the elixirs; the symbolic and mystical language used by the initiates; the magical practices closely bound up with the Art; the association of metals with the sun, moon and planets all these characteristics are common to Chinese alchemy and to the more familiar alchemy of the West. It is possible that they arose independently; it is possible that China drew from Alexandria (as she assuredly did, later, from Islam); and it is possible that we must seek a still more remote common origin for both Alexandrian and Chinese alchemy; but the resemblance between them is so close that no more fascinating enquiry could be desired by an historian of science. Is the connecting link to be found in India? Will further investigation reveal the birthplace of alchemy to lie in that ancient Aryan civilization which spread its influence eastward, westward and northward—and southward was limited only by the sea? That question cannot yet be answered, but perhaps the revelation awaits us among the unread manuscripts in the great libraries of Indian princes.

ERIC J. HOLMYARD

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

(Considered from a Monadistic or Personalistic standpoint)

[**Dr. J. K. Majumdar, M. A., B. L. (Calcutta), Ph. D. (London)** is Barrister at Law by profession but is seriously interested in the study of philosophy. At one time he was a Professor of Philosophy and Psychology at the Calcutta Presidency College. He edited a research work on Hindu Philosophy *The Sankhya Conception of Personality* by his late father, and he is a contributor to numerous philosophical journals.—EDS.]

Without entering upon the academic controversy of pessimism and optimism, let us examine in what sense evil is a reality. The chief source of difficulty has been that evil has been considered to be a *principle*, opposed to the principle of good, and that some measure of absolute negativity has been attributed to it. But such a supposition cannot be justified. Spinoza long ago maintained that looked at from the eternal point of view evil as a principle has no reality. This is corroborated by the fact that evil is only *relative* in character. What is an evil to one person is not so to another; and, again, what is an evil under one set of circumstances is not so under another set of circumstances. Everything has a certain position and value in the system of the universe and it is only when taken out of its position or ascribed a different value that it comes to appear as an evil. Therefore, evil has reality only as constituting a hindrance; and this notion of hindrance lies at the basis of our common notion of evil as something detrimental to one's interest or purpose. But such hindrance is not absolutely detrimental to one's interest or purpose, but is a necessary condition for their furtherance. Let us turn to the particular forms of evil, named moral and physical, and try to determine what they imply.

Moral evil: Throughout life there ensues a struggle between reason and sensibility, or, on a monadistic or personalistic theory between the ends and purposes of the dominant monad and of the subordinate—monads. Moral life progresses through moral evils, such as disrespect for the rights of others, violation of duty, and personal vices. For instance, excessive drinking, though in one sense it implies a sort of satisfaction for the wants of the body—the organism composed of the subordinate monads,—it is held to be a positive moral evil, inasmuch as it is a hindrance to the self-realization of the moral individual. Perhaps the greatest difficulty that confronts the monadistic or personalistic theory that we are advocating here, consists in the anomaly that if drink satisfies in a way some sort of craving of the subordinate monads, how is it that it is deleterious to the subordinate monads themselves; and how can it be compatible with the notion that the spirit is the

basis of things as implied in our theory? Let us first answer the question from the point of view of the subordinate monads themselves. It is true that excessive drinking soon leads to the deterioration of the bodily organism and its premature death yet, perhaps, the misconception lies in supposing that death is an ultimate evil and an absolute loss. From the monadistic or personalistic point of view death is simply a dissolution of a particular sort of organization of the monads, and far from being an ultimate loss may prove to be beneficial in some future set of circumstances, and from a different point of view. The present organization of the monads being founded on some sort of 'agreement' or 'fitting in,' any dissolution or breaking away from the established organization cannot be viewed as wholly detrimental to their welfare, though it may be relatively so. Though it is very difficult to corroborate this contention by scientific evidence, yet we may rest it on the supposition that the ultimate ground of things is spiritual. In the second place, let us look at this problem from the point of view of the dominant monad or the individual. Obviously, excessive drinking is a positive moral evil to the individual though he may not be conscious of it, for man does not desire evil *knowingly*. Any premature death of the bodily organism is no doubt an evil or hindrance to the self-realization of the individual, who has to realise himself in and through the body; he being the dominant unit in the present commonwealth of different units with diverse and conflicting interests, it is his duty to preserve the organization as long as he can by keeping it in a healthy condition and 'in tone'. Any deviation from this responsibility is a positive moral evil. The present body possesses its chief value *mainly* because of the dominant monad; what may not be an evil from the point of view of the subordinate monads, may be a positive hindrance from that of the dominant monad. In this sense evil is positive, but it is not absolute. The essential condition of the consciousness of duty is a conflict between reason and sensibility, or between the dominant monad and the subordinate monads. When the higher self or reason prevails and prompts us to act upon the principle suggested by it, we are said to do our duty and the result is a moral good; but when mere sensibility prevails and prompts us to do an act we often fail to do our duty and the result is a moral evil. The chief duty of the individual lies in developing the higher powers of reason and in subordinating and in bringing into harmony the functions of the subordinate monads. And this is not only good for the individual, but also for the subordinate monads.

Self-realization is only possible through the growth of self-consciousness and self-consciousness arises out of the interaction between the self and the not-self or other selves. This process of

working out its own perfection is called gathering experience and it is acquired by way of trial and error. "Where several possibilities are open," observes Dr. Ward, "a creature acting on its own initiative can only find out the right one by way of trial and often of error. Such error we may say is an evil; but we cannot straight away call it a superfluous evil, still less an absolute evil, if it is an inevitable incident of experience as such, and if in general the experience is worth what it costs". (*Realm of Ends*, p. 356). Yet in spite of these pitfalls the end does not depend on mere chance and is not uncertain of being realized.

Physical evil: Physical evil is what is caused by nature without or within us. Nature without us thwarts our needs and purposes in many ways. An unfavourable climate, storms, lightnings, earthquakes, etc., are external agencies that are taken to oppose our needs and purposes, and to be positively injurious to us. Some defects of nature within us, *e. g.*, infirmities and diseases, are supposed to be no less injurious to the realization of our end. This supposition again seems to be totally unfounded. Though it is impossible to prove that these 'evils' have a place in the economy of nature, it is equally impossible to show that they are superfluous. The view that such 'evils' have a real place in the economy of nature presents no insuperable difficulty. External nature is a system of monads also plastic and capable of experience and differ from us not in kind but only in degree of mental development. They are also intent on the betterment of their condition, and each has an end to attain. If we are warranted in asserting so much, then it would be a mistake to suppose that such physical evils are absolute or superfluous, without the recognition that the physical condition which may be unfavourable to us may be favourable to another, as the wind that is good for the homeward bound will be bad for that bound outwards.

From such considerations, then, one may urge that evil is an hindrance only, is relative and is not a principle. Moreover this hindrance is the essential condition of progress. It is only in surmounting it that advance is made. This is a stern truth and cannot be denied. We can therefore say that at least a temporary solidarity obtains between good and evil. Even the worst sort of disease is not an unmixed evil, in some cases it immensely enriches the spiritual life of the sufferer. In a word, there is no dualism of good and evil. The existence of this hindrance may be traced to a misunderstanding on the part of individuals resulting from ignorance. Hence we do find the world-wide association between evil and ignorance. The problem of evil presents the greatest difficulty in the face of the assertion of the moral order of the universe. But the root of this difficulty lies in the conception of the flagrant dualism of matter and spirit, the former of

which has been considered as the stumbling block in the way of self-realization of spirit. But on a monadistic or personalistic conception of the world this difficulty is greatly relieved.

A monad of higher mental development may be said to encounter hindrance when in its self-realization it finds opposition from monads of lower mental development, with their own ends to realize; if the monad of a higher mental development cannot avoid such opposition then it may be spoken of as being in a lapsed condition and such "lapse" may be described as an evil *to it*. But such lapses have a meaning and necessity for other monads of lower development; because, between these monads there obtains a solidarity, an interdependence. It is only through overcoming hindrance that positive advance is possible. Without any hindrance the advance would be poor in contents and might be likened to the 'fugitive and cloistered virtue' that is feeble and imperfect compared with the virtue that 'sallies forth and sees her adversary'. A world without hindrance could never become a moral world.

But all this applies to the present world and to the present circumstances. Evolution implies at one extreme a world beyond good and evil where evil is no more. At other extreme it would imply a world where evil is impossible because good is impossible. The human world lies between these two extremes, where evil is at once possible and avoidable. And if the notion of the ultimate ground of things as spiritual be true, then human evolution can fitly be described as proceeding towards the establishment of a moral order in the true sense.

J. K. MAJUMDAR

"The real evil proceeds from human intelligence and its origin rests entirely with reasoning man who dissociates himself from Nature. Humanity then alone is the true source of evil. . . . It is not nature that creates diseases, but man. The latter's mission and destiny in the economy of nature is to die his natural death brought by old age . . . . Food, sexual relations, drink, are all natural necessities of life; yet excess in them brings on disease, misery, suffering, mental and physical, and the latter are transmitted as the greatest evils to future generations, the progeny of the culprits. Ambition, the desire of securing happiness and comfort for those we love, by obtaining honours and riches, are praiseworthy natural feelings but when they transform man into an ambitious cruel tyrant, a miser, a selfish egotist they bring untold misery on those around them; on nations as well as on individuals. All this then—food, wealth, ambition, and a thousand other things we have to leave unmentioned, becomes the source and cause of evil whether in its abundance or through its absence. Become a glutton, debauchee, a tyrant, and you become the originator of diseases, of human suffering and misery. Lack all this and you starve, you are despised as a *nobody* and the majority of the herd, your fellow men, make of you a sufferer your whole life. Therefore it is neither nature nor an imaginary Deity that has to be blamed, but human nature made vile by *selfishness*."

MAHATMA K. H.

FIVE LIGHTS AT THE CROSS ROADS

V.—SIMEON BEN YOHAI

[**Geoffrey West** concludes a fascinating series of five biographies of spiritual heroes not widely known. He wrote on "Ptolemy Soter", "Apollonius of Tyana," "Simon Magus," and "Hillel" in our March, May, July and September issues.–EDS.]

Hillel must stand as in many ways the ideal type of the initiate, deep in knowledge yet declaring but little save to those worthy and, therefore, no less discreet. Yet is it strange that to glimpse more than the merest outline of his teaching one has to go to so much less attractive, indeed so much more *narrowly* national a figure as Simeon ben Yohai, pupil of Akiba, who was pupil of Joshua ben Hananiah, who was pupil of Johanan ben Zakkai, who was pupil of Hillel. The character of Simeon, as presented on one hand in his life and on the other in the works ascribed to him, is so self-contradictory that some writers have suggested, in the face of the force of all tradition, that he was coldly rationalistic in his teachings, that he did nothing to investigate the hidden meanings of the scriptures, that he represented in fact a decisive reaction against the Kabbalistic tendencies of his master Akiba, and that his supposed authorship of the *Zohar* is due simply to the once common custom of including in the general title of a work the first name mentioned in the text! Yet, as A. E. Waite admitted, it is not easy to accept a tradition for a teaching and at the same time reject its leading figure.

The anomaly remains, only to be resolved by ascribing to Simeon a private as well as a public character. In the latter capacity he appears as a man of uncompromising strength of will and dominating personality, proud, quick to anger, cold, ascetic, superior, dogmatic, strict, severe. He was born in Galilee probably towards the end of the first century A. D. Following the siege of Jerusalem Johanan ben Zakkai had re-established "the school of Hillel" at Jabneh with the consent of Vespasian, and there created a new centre of Judaism inheriting the authority of the temporarily scattered Sanhedrin. The second Gamaliel succeeded him, and in a day of dwindling power and prestige strengthened both by healing the breach between the followers of Hillel and those of Shammai. To Jabneh came Simeon to study first perhaps under Joshua ben Hananiah and subsequently at the feet of the mystic and kabbalist Akiba, his teacher for thirteen years. He left to live at Sidon, but returned frequently to consult with his beloved master, and when the latter was imprisoned by the Ro-

mans (who at last, in 132, flayed him to death) Simeon continued to visit him in his cell. Akiba had recognised Simeon's merit, and among all his pupils "ordained" only him and one other. But instead of being proud of such distinction Simeon was angered to share it; he felt that first place belonged to him alone, and Akiba had to sooth him with "soft words".

This curious spirit of pride was to find expression on at least one other even more notable occasion, and under circumstances which really do suggest a deep-rooted defect in Simeon's character. He regarded the Romans as tyrants, and speaking his mind too freely was condemned to death. To escape that penalty he fled with his son to a secret cave, there to live for thirteen years, fed by a miraculous date-tree. The period was passed in the study of the Pentateuch, and in instruction in the mysteries by such sublime masters as Moses and Elijah. He grew ripe in wisdom, yet when at the end of twelve years he was called forth from the cave his first action was to cast scorn upon the workers in the fields whose labours left them little time for meditation on the scriptures. For this unjust presumption he and his unfortunate son were condemned to a further penitential year, but when he re-emerged his knowledge was found to be unsurpassed among all his fellow-countrymen. He established a school at Meron, and there lived for many years revered as a great teacher. Strange powers were ascribed to him, and his success when he carried to Rome a petition against oppressive decrees was attributed to his magical gifts. To the end, however, he seems to have displayed needless insistence in claiming a unique merit for himself and his son, declaring that if but two living persons deserved to enter heaven, they would be chosen! Yet did not Jesus (who also cursed the barren fig-tree) upon occasion make equally large claims?—sometimes it is a very fine line which must be drawn between presumption and a certain knowledge.

As a public teacher Simeon was dogmatic and definitive without being pedantic; he sought to penetrate to the reason lying at the root of every ordinance, and to interpret that latter in its light. He spoke always with decision and independence, and his exposition of the Law was essentially rationalistic. But another and more important aspect appears in his mystical commentaries upon the haggadic writings. More and more as he grew older he was excused the ordinary duties of a rabbi in order that he might give his time to instructing his own especial group of disciples, to whom under an oath of secrecy he revealed many things. He knew, it was said, "all," more than any man since the days of Moses himself, and he was troubled by his responsibility on the one hand to pass on his knowledge, and on the other to prevent its falling into evil hands.

"Woe if I reveal!" he lamented, "woe if I do not reveal!" In the event he communicated much, but probably less than his full knowledge; the illumination of those who came after him seems to have been comparatively but partial. The writings he left to them, or which, more probably, they set down from their recollection of his teachings were at best fragmentary, and, though they supply one of the first attempts to state in writing the mysteries of man and the universe, much is lacking. Yet after his death his name was indissolubly connected with the mystic knowledge; and the works ascribed to him, and certainly, directly or otherwise, born of his proficiency, became a main authority for all Kabbalists. These works included many of the Zoharic treatises: *The Book of Concealment*, the first form in which the secret teaching of Simeon was written down; *The Greater Sacred Assembly*, which reports discourses to his disciples the gist of which is summed up in the sentence: "The Ancient of Ancients is in Microprosopus; all things are one; He was all things; He is all things; He will be all things; He shall know no change; He knoweth no change; He hath known no change"; *The Lesser Sacred Assembly* in which Simeon is sole speaker; and *The Faithful Shepherd* which records his conversations with Moses.

Their teachings are indeed essentially theosophical, from their immanent God beyond all possibility of knowledge, their doctrine of emanations, their dualism dissolving at the ultimate point into an absolute monism, to their machinery—if the word may be allowed—of spheres, angels, and demiurges. They look backward and forward, and make all things one in their apprehension of the essential truth of all religions. Loyal Kabbalists would declare their wisdom to have been taught first by God (the Word, the Son, rather than the Silence, the Father) in paradise to a select company of the angels, who following the Fall communicated something of their knowledge to Man that by its means he might laboriously ascend again to recover his lost innocence. From Adam it came to Noah, from Noah to Abraham, who revealed it to the Egyptians, who first instructed Moses. But Moses also learnt much in the wilderness, and his later understanding was unparalleled in his day; he laid down for those to come after him the principles of his wisdom in the first four books of the pentateuch; he also initiated seventy of the elders, from whom knowledge passed down from teacher to teacher, none before Simeon daring to put it into writing. A more strictly "scientific" account would trace it back at least to the days of the Babylonian captivity. A wider view still might look even deeper into time and farther afield to see it as an offshoot of the ancient Wisdom Religion of Asia itself, a transparent garment for that truth which lies at

the hearts alike of Buddhist, Egyptian, Babylonian, Sanskrit, Zend, and Chinese writings. (The *Zohar* certainly contains truths known to the Hindus in remote ages, but only discovered by Western science of comparatively recent years.) In it the "partial illumination" originally accorded to Israel, was revivified and crystallised by the Alexandrian rebirth of mystical knowledge and discussion, carried freely from Egypt to Palestine by intimate Jewish connections.

The wisdom of Simeon was the sacred—and largely secret—possession of the Jewish teachers of mystic knowledge for many hundreds of years, being handed down from generation to generation as a still largely oral tradition known only to the initiated few who by long trial had proved themselves worthy, the actual rare manuscripts being added to ever and again as seemed desirable or necessary. Thus the existing Kabbalistic writings represent the accretions of the centuries upon an early basis, intruding into the original matter later borrowings from Hellenistic, Neo-Platonic, Stoic, Gnostic, Zoroastrian, and even Christian sources. As a result of the Crusades, the Jewish teachers, and their knowledge, were scattered wide over Europe. There is mention of a text entitled *The Mysteries of Simeon ben Yohai* in or before the eleventh century, but it was two hundred years later that a compilation of various manuscripts was produced by Moses de Leon, a rabbi of Guadalaxara in Spain, and circulated by him as the work of Simeon. It was almost immediately challenged as a forgery, but later study has confirmed its authentic nature. It was printed at Mantua in 1558 in the form in which it has come down to us to-day, and since then has never ceased to attract attention and to win an ever-deepening regard and influence in the wider world. It was, says Waite, perhaps the first of all books appearing in the West to state certainly "that God is altogether without mutation or vicissitude—that wrath and judgment are of man alone," that "the repayment of God is the compensation of everlasting justice".

So, in a very real sense, the illumination of the past falls upon the present. Egypt was long the immediate home of transcendent wisdom for the West, the most ancient centre outside Asia itself, but for a thousand years before Ptolemy it had been losing the essential keys of its understanding. The form, if not the essence, was becoming flawed and debased. Alexander, ambitious conqueror, laid the road open once more to India, but it was Ptolemy who established Alexandria as the meeting-place for seven hundred years of East and West, who by his Museum and Library made it a centre for the gathering and exchange of many wisdoms, and who in the conception of Serapis pointed once again to an eternal Truth masked by the many aspects of the multitudinous gods. Had Ptolemy been other than the man he was, then Apollonius might still have penetrated to India, but without the light of Alexandrian learning and curiosity to shine over the whole Mediterranean civilisation the world of his youth and his age must have been strangely darkened and unresponsive, and the knowledge of Simon Magus, of Hillel and of Simeon becomes a thing if not incredible then strangely improbable. Each of these men paved the way, however indirectly, for those who came after him. They are links in a chain leading out from the labyrinth of an impressive past into a present grown strangely small even as foreground to its long vista. Beyond that—whither?

GEOFFREY WEST

This drama of the struggle of Prometheus with the Olympic tyrant and despot, sensual Zeus, one sees enacted daily within our actual mankind: the lower passions chain the higher aspirations to the rock of matter, to generate in many a case the vulture of sorrow, pain, and repentance. In every such case one sees once more

> "A god . . . in fetters, anguish fraught;
> The foe of Zeus, in hatred held by all . . ."

A god bereft even of that supreme consolation of Prometheus, who suffered in self-sacrifice—

> "For that to men he bare too fond a mind . . ."

as the divine Titan is moved by altruism, but the mortal man by Selfishness and Egoism in every instance.

The modern Prometheus has now become *Epi-metheus*, "he who sees only after the event"; because the universal philanthropy of the former has long ago degenerated into selfishness and self-adoration. Man will become the *free* Titan of old, but not before cyclic evolution has re-established the broken harmony between the two natures—the terrestrial and the divine; after which he becomes impermeable to the lower titanic forces, invulnerable in his personality, and immortal in his individuality, which cannot happen before every animal element is eliminated from his nature. When man understands that "*Deus non fecit mortem* (*Sap. I.*, 13), but that man has created it himself, he will re-become the Prometheus before his Fall.

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. II, p. 422

THE EXPERIMENTAL ORIGIN OF KNOWLEDGE II

[**W. Wilson Leisenring, B.A.,** is the author of *The Real Earth, Too Small for Life,* etc. and at one time was associate-editor of *World Power.*—EDS.]

As a physiological organism there is no doubt that the human form is the acme of physical evolution; but even so it may be questioned whether the race as it is to-day utilizes all the potentialities of the human brain, that is, of the frontal lobes which the latest researches have definitely shown to be the organ of human volitional functions. Modern science knows nothing experimentally about 'free will' itself, although some men of science have attributed 'indeterminacy' or ' free-will' to certain states of radiation. But, as no other form has been found, on earth or in space, with a brain adapted to the conscious use of volition, it were, perhaps, wiser to investigate the supposed free-will of man himself before ascribing these higher human powers to entities of Nature. Only the automatic, reflective functions of the ***animal*** brain, the cerebellum, have been investigated in physio-psychological researches. The properties and powers of that portion (the cerebrum) through which function truly ***human*** characteristics have still to be explored by modern science.

Formerly, scientific authorities considered the human brain to be merely a highly developed animal organ, and human faculties to be ***essentially*** similar to animal senses. Consequently, no scientific importance was attached to discussions on mind and free-will; but researches have now compelled recognition of a fundamental distinction between the functions of the posterior and frontal cranial areas: and in all higher animal species the frontal area, the cerebrum, is merely rudimentary. This result of research is one of the most important confirmations of *The Secret Doctrine*, and suggests a cardinal factor in the origin of its knowledge.

Recently, also, palæontologists have been gradually coming to the conclusion that Man, the highest product of physical evolution, is not the latest; that he has existed on this planet for a much longer period than was believed possible according to the Darwinian theory. His earliest advent had been placed first in the late Quaternary Age; then in the earlier Quaternary; but in 1930 the conclusions of various workers, summed up in Professor Fairfield Osborn's "Dawn Man," were finally adopted officially, and the discovery of human forbears in tertiary strata "is likely to be a triumph of the 20th century".* Thus man—*homo sapiens*—the creature of thought and will is admitted to have existed on this earth for unknown millions of years. Most of

* *Nature*, Jan. 11. 1930, p. 61.

the second volume of *The Secret Doctrine* is devoted to an exposition of the archaic statements regarding the antiquity of the human race, its origin and its triple, interdependent evolution——spiritual, psychic, and physical.

In view, therefore, of the antiquity of a type of physical man as perfect physiologically as any specimens now existing, it would seem impossible that his volitional powers could never have been understood at any prior period of human history. With his cranial dynamic organ at man's disposal one would think that at some time in the cycles of innumerable civilizations, ancient seekers of knowledge must have used their volitional powers more effectively than men do today. It is not improbable, too, that they may have reversed the sequence in the order of their experiments and have begun their researches in matter at the opposite extreme of density to that in which modern science inaugurated its investigations. In which case, their process of externalizing would have begun by objectifying thought itself or the mental energy-matter—the vibrating substance—in which man thinks. Were such a procedure possible the following considerations would have to be taken into account:—

1. If thought be characteristic of fields of space otherwise empty for physical science, it is clear that these states could not be objective to an observer functioning in the same state or level. He must change his 'position,' that is, reverse his poles and function above, beyond, or within them, in still deeper levels.

2. These states could not be correctly described except in terms of the perceptive organ that contacts them. If they are interpreted in terms of other organs of sense the *specialized* characteristics of these lower senses will be erroneously ascribed to those higher states.

3. If, as science has demonstrated, lower frequencies are the product of higher, the latter are the proximate cause of the former. Thus, the power of reproduction originates 'above' and is carried 'down' into concrete conditions. The laws, or the intelligence, of the higher will also be found in the lower, though exhibited differently according to the degree and kind of its differentiation from the elementary or primary state.

4. Consequently it would be possible for an investigator who began his researches at higher levels to discover the principle regulating or governing those states—a principle which would apply generally also to all below. He might then work down or outward experimentally, guided by the deductive method.

For the sake of argument, we may postulate two hypothetical scientific workers who begin their investigations from opposite directions, so to speak. One by concentrating his 'free-will' externalizes his thoughts about the physical, concrete world around him by planning and conducting

chemical and physical experiments. The other would use his will-power to externalize his thoughts as such in the level and therefore, at the instant, they occur. Both experimenters must learn, *first of all*, how to insulate the materials used in experiment from interference by extraneous influences. As the first worker probes deeper into matter he finds it more and more difficult to isolate his chemical materials, and at a certain point his experiments come to a standstill until a container is devised that can be emptied of the 'air' in the surrounding atmosphere. The vacuum tube had to be invented before the existence of ultra-violet rays of light became known. Probing farther and farther into electro-chemical matter, this worker finds his field of experiment invaded by apparently sporadic flashes of energy which jump in and out of the field from deeper depths of atomic spaces. High-power instruments are brought into use in an attempt to trace the paths of these miniature wanderers in space; but, in spite of more than ten years' research, they cannot be identified individually, nor their individual cycles calculated. Apparently they are unregulated by inexorable cyclic law; apparently each comes and goes fancy-free and appears on our screen of time at will. The worker is nonplussed. He pauses to ask: Is it, then, impossible to isolate these 'atoms' or 'quanta' and control their appearance? Are they an energy undetermined by prior physical causes? If so, they must surely be the product of free-will and merely convey *thought* impulse. Can man discover the secret of their freedom?

The other worker should be able to answer these questions if he has accomplished the feat hypothetically assigned to him, and has objectified his own thoughts and emotions, and has insulated his consciousness from invasion by any other thoughts, ideas or desires. The first worker's attitude towards the new phenomena is *negative*. The other worker must have become *positive* in relation to the phenomena he is investigating; he must have 'reversed his poles' and have centred his consciousness farther within his field of thought if he has succeeded in externalizing or visualizing the substance of his thoughts: he must consciously use and control the energy that produces the forms of thought. It is obvious that the laboratory of such experiments must be the experimenter's own organism. Hence there must be organs in the brain capable of sensing, or responding to, ultra-physical levels of light and of *polarizing these at will*. The considerations given above in the four numbered paragraphs indicate that the functioning of these organs, if under rigorous control, should enable the worker to learn how ultra-physical energies reproduce or reflect themselves in molecular states; how structures are built up in lower frequencies; how inner states of

tension expand outwardly and finally exhibit 'surface tension' in viscous substances and electro-magnetic cohesion in concrete matter.

Were a method of research possible such as is very vaguely suggested above, our two hypothetical workers would be within hailing distance to-day and a meeting imminent. And, as they approach one another from opposite directions, the one who is 'descending' should be able to predict the outcome of the researches of him who is 'ascending' —even to foretelling, perhaps, the predicament in which he now finds himself. But he will not be understood until the distance between them permits of intelligible communication.

> That which in the *Secret Doctrine* is referred to as the unmanifested planes, are unmanifested or planes of non-being only from the point of view of the finite intellect; ... (*Transactions of Blavatsky Lodge*, p. 111)
>
> There are seven states of matter of which three are generally known, viz. solid, liquid, and gaseous. (*Ib.* p. 101) [Since then a fourth state, electromagnetic radiation,has become known.] ...

H. P. Blavatsky claimed that she had obtained her knowledge by an experimental training different from the usual scientific method, and that she had been taught by research workers, unknown to the world in general, who were versed in an arcane scientific procedure handed down through generations of those trained in this method. Some of these men had studied, also, in Western universities and were acquainted with the progress, methods and outlook of Western science. Comparing the results so far obtained in the West with their own knowledge, they foresaw that the investigations of imminent scientists would soon come within range of certain of the rarer states of matter with which they themselves were familiar. They foresaw the *impasse* and the inevitable reaction to abortive speculation and anthropomorphism. Madame Blavatsky was, therefore, commissioned and assisted to give to the intellectual classes some of the findings of arcane science.

The above may be considered far-fetched, but it illustrates one aspect of the universal law of cyclic evolution which H. P. Blavatasky unearthed from archaic records. Both physics and chemistry now endorse the conception that involution and evolution are complementary principles operating in the physical world; and from the depths of Space come rays that by interaction recreate and sustain physical matter.

Again, history records that pioneers from older, civilized races stimulate the evolution of less matured races; and, from the consciousness of highly developed geniuses comes an impact on the minds of thinking men that eventually differentiates one era from another. Interaction between the 'high' and the 'low,' between elementary and highly organized states, seems to be a law of existence and an essential condition for evolution and progress.

W. WILSON LEISENRING

MYSTICISM OF THE DRUSES

[**Syed A. Rafique** is a Muslim who graduated with honours in Philosophy at Cambridge and is now a resident in England.—EDS.]

There comes a stage when by concentration and meditation, one is released from the trammels of the sensuous world and achieves an esoteric understanding of the universe. So have held the great mystics of the world belonging to what are ***apparently*** diametrically opposed religions and philosophies.

In a materialistic civilization when the ***combat*** with nature (foolish at times) has dulled the higher intuitive powers, such things may, and do, appear as vapourings of an unbalanced mind. The unscientific scientist of the modern age is so blinded by the glare of the sense world that he cannot penetrate beyond his hidebound realm, based as it is merely on observation and induction. But in countries where the intimacy with the marvellous has obtained for centuries, it is impossible to ignore these phenomena however great an attempt is made at rationalization.

With a religion that translates itself wholly into outward behaviour, achievement of a contemplative esoteric unity with followers of other religions is difficult if not impossible. But where the higher meditative plane can be reached, Mohammedans, Christians, Buddhists and Nature-Worshippers all can enter into a holy communion. That is what Madame Blavatsky in her chapter on Syrian secret societies (*Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 289 *et seq*) and especially in her account of the 'Druzes' has held and rightly so.

It must be confessed that the evidences of similarity of teaching of the mystic of every age, be he a Neo-Platonist, Pythagorean, or Buddhist, is too forceful to be brushed aside with contumely. We have to allow that mystics of all creeds have a kind of freemasonry amongst them. Professor E. G. Browne has sought to deny the influence of Buddhistic philosophy on Muslim Sufis. But then he stands against both Dozy and von Kremmer. Trumpp in fact explicitly states that Sufism is not only an Indian product "but still nearer to Buddhistic notions". Of the four secret sects of Syria, Nosairi's, Ismaili's, Metawali's and the Druses, the last mentioned are the most interesting.

Much speculation about their secret meetings have been made and volumes published which, as Madame Blavatsky points out, are mere conglomerations of hypotheses. This charge that she levels against de Sacy's pretentious book *Expose de la Religion des Druses* applies equally to the Muslim westernized savant the Rt. Hon. Syed Amir Ali.

The Druses are essentially an esoteric cult. Their God is quite like Böehme's unpredicatable and unknowable. And He is capable of incarnating Himself into a human being. This they believe happened in the person of Ali, and of Hakim, the sixth Fatimite Caliph of Egypt (A. D. 996). Hamza, his lieutenant, was the Universal Wisdom, Christos or Messiah.

The Druses divide their people into three groups :

(1) the Juhhals, or the ignorants and uninitiated ;
(2) the Akkils, or the wise and initiated ;
(3) the Ajawids, or the principals.

Madame Blavatsky's information from an initiate merits a special attention. It is apparently an impartial account of the ceremony of initiation, which, to the outside world, is a complete mystery. It would appear from the testimony of Professor Rawson that though the Druses are Nature Worshippers the calumnies against them should be discounted.

The Druses are not only connected with the Batimi's of the Shiah sect who interpret scriptures by allegory but are also influenced by Kabbalistic and Pythagorean doctrines of Numbers which Plato also took over during his later period. The number seven is the magical number. Further, they also repudiate heaven and hell and take up the transmigration of soul and the absorption of the finite spirit into the Infinite akin to Buddhists' Nirvana.

They are courageous people and their Akkils have a strict course of probation. Their women join in their worship though separated by a transparent screen ; and they can attain the highest order. The doctrine of Takkiya or the profession of a faith merely outwardly is partly due to the persecution inflicted on these people and partly to their notion of tolerance. Outward behaviour being unimportant, it is better than not to live peaceably with the society. Perhaps for the same reason they do not seek proselytes. The very important meetings held in complete seclusion and great secrecy and attended by the highest of the order are said to be visited by Hamza himself. The common charge of licentiousness against all mystics of every age is levelled against them as well but there is really no proof ; for in practice the Druses are found just as trustworthy as followers of any other faith. Their seven tablets have nothing which could be made the object of derision being only some simple and wholesome rules.

The most important settlement is at Mount Hauran in Syria, and since the Turkish persecution it has grown more populous. The Druses believe that Hakim will one day come out of his hidden place and will establish the Kingdom of God. With this buoyant vision before them their life is full of hope and expectancy.

SYED A. RAFIQUE

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

PHILOSOPHY AND MYSTICISM*

[**J. D. Beresford's** criticisms prompt us to refer our readers to the Theosophical view of the circle of evolution described by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Secret Doctrine* I, p. 17, half of which is traced by "Natural Impulse" resulting in the birth of self-conscious individuality and the remaining, by its "self-induced and self-devised efforts, checked by its Karma".—EDS.]

It is nearly a quarter of a century since Bergson's most impressive work, "Creative Evolution," was first published and in the interval he has suffered the experience, ***inter alia***, of living through the years of the War. That his philosophy was, in some sense, disturbed by this world crisis is evident in the present work, although he tells us that the first news came to him with a strange sense of completing the expectation put into his mind in 1871, at a time when France was whispering to herself that this was not the end, and that presently the hour would strike for the great "Revanche".

Nevertheless the Bergson of seventy exhibits the same mentality, the same ability to trace out the intricate spirals of logical reasoning that won for him as early as 1889 a place among the more considerable philosophers of his own time, a place that was, from one point of view finally confirmed by the award of the Nobel Prize for Literature forty years later. He is still an intellectual, desiring in his own words "rester aussi près que possible des faits"; and in this closely reasoned analysis that he has made of the two sources of Morality and Religion, we see him clutching, a little desperately now and again, to the skirts of the theory, in which he posited his Elan Vital as the instrument of an anonymous Creator.

His main distinction in the opening chapters of the present work is based upon his own postulates of the "open" and the "closed," the first kind of order being that of "the ***vital*** or the ***willed***, in opposition to the second which is that of the ***inert*** and the ***automatic***".† With this criterion he examines firstly the sources of morality, comparatively easy ground, and distinguishes between the "morality" of the insect world, as illustrated by the closed system obtaining in the hive or the formicary, and the open one which in man is the outcome of intelligence. The former he describes as practically somnambulistic. The latter arises in the world of

* *Les Deux Sources de la Morale et de la Religion* par Henri Bergson. (Librairie Felix Alcan) 25 francs.

† *Creative Evolution*, English translation, By ARTHUR MITCHELL. London, 1911.

humanity from the influence of reason. "One has been willed by nature, the other is an 'apport' of human genius. One is characterised by a totality of habits which in man has a symmetrical correspondence to the instincts of the animal and is less than intelligence. The other manifests aspiration, intuition and emotion," —the human "apport,"—and is greater than intelligence. (p. 62).

This is an exceedingly promising opening. It assumes the doctrine of "holism," (the "tendency in nature to join wholes that are more than the sum of the parts, by creative evolution"), and leaves an opening for almost any of the assumptions of an idealist as opposed to a merely vitalist philosophy. But M. Bergson, though he is so obviously aware of his dilemma, is somewhat over eager to keep a foot in either camp. So long as he is dealing with the development of moral obligation, of the development on pragmatical grounds of the duty to our neighbour through the instrumentality of intelligence, which connotes a measure of prescience or at least of reasonable anticipation,—he goes bravely forward, lucid, logical and graphic as he has always been. It is when he comes to the human "apport," the unevaluated factor in holism, as an element in religion that he begins to hesitate, to prevaricate, finally refusing to commit himself to any statement that might brand him as a mystic rather than as a metaphysician.

We come to this by way of his analysis of religion and four italicised deductions. The first of these, on page 127 is that "religion is nature's defensive reaction against the solvent power of intelligence". The second (page 137), that from a second point of view, "religion is nature's defensive reaction against the presentation by intelligence of the inevitability of death". The third (page 147) asserts that "religion's representations of death are nature's defensive reactions against the representation by the intelligence of a discouraging, unforeseen latitude between the initiative taken and the effect desired". The fourth (p. 219) that, assuming the earlier deductions, "religion is nature's defensive reaction against whatever there might be in the exercise of intelligence that would depress the individual and break up society". To which it must be added before we proceed with our examination that the "religion" as here defined is classified as "static," some form of primitive religion, or of that closed, wholly or in part by the dogma necessary to confine the teachings of a particular sect, this type being opposed to the "dynamic" religion exhibited in mysticism.

There are further qualifications and contingents in this connection, but the general purpose of these deductions is quite clear. They are put forward in defence of the general argument for creative evolution, and designed to fill an uncomfortable hiatus. On the other side it has been held

that the religious sense appearing in primitive man,—and M. Bergson here posits that "there has never been a society without a religion"—appears to serve no purpose either protective or developmental from an evolutionary point of view, and by extension this reasoning has been made a ground for the claim that there has been a spiritual evolution of quite another order from the physical or the intellectual.*

M. Bergson now meets this contention by positing a "defensive reaction in nature," not, so far as we gather, working with a conscious purpose but meeting and overcoming situations as they arise by the energy of its vital thrust into being. And we are asked to believe, therefore—though the example is not cited by M. Bergson,—that Totemism is an instance of nature's "reaction" against the dawning intelligence, a development that by the exercise of reason and the foresight of death might "depress the individual and break up his social tendencies". But surely this is to assume an "apport" in the working of the Elan Vital which is hardly consistent with the premises? Is it at all credible that this device,—for indeed it is far more like a device than a reaction,— is in any way representative of, or consistent with, the working of Creative Evolution as the author expounds it in his earlier treatise and in the work now under consideration? Is there *a fortiori*, any shadow of evidence outside the philosopher's own mind, to show how this "defensive reaction" first manifested itself as a protection against that "solvent power of intelligence" which threatened to bar the expression of the life-force?

Nor does it help us to consider this problem in the light of an imaginative flight made by M. Bergson in a later chapter. After letting his mind speculate for a moment on the possibility that in other corners of the universe, the "creative energy of love" may work more freely, he says that "everything tends to show that in this world the matter which is complementary to life, was little designed to favour the *élan*. The original impulse has therefore brought about divergent evolutionary progressions, instead of being maintained undivided up to the goal" (p. 275). Are we then to assume, perhaps that the greater resistance of this world's gross matter has sharpened the wits—if the phrase be not irreverent?—of the "creative energy of love," to the point of developing those dogmatic, static religions as a temporary expedient to save humanity and society until it were sufficiently far advanced to prove receptive to the higher impulse?

To us, it must be confessed, the whole argument so far as it is designed to save the conception of the Elan Vital from the attribution to it of conscious, reasoning purpose in this connection, has an uncomfortable effect of evading a difficulty by endowing "nature"

* See *The Evolution of Religion* in the September number of THE ARYAN PATH.

with reactions which have all the air of deliberate reason. May it not be suggested, in fact, that these reactions of "nature" correspond far too nearly to the predetermined plan of a creator?

But we must leave this explanation of the birth of "static" religions and come to the consideration of the dynamic where, indeed, we find M. Bergson more perplexed than ever in his approach to the subject of mysticism.

He begins by ranging himself in this connection, with William James whom he quotes (p. 263) as declaring that he had had no mystical experience, but that when he spoke with a man who had had such experience something within him responded. (quelque-chose en lui faisait éche). From this he proceeds to grant a certain validity to the records of the mystics, as being in accord one with another, but makes it clear that he recognises but one true order of mysticism, namely the Christian. After a consideration of Eastern mysticism he dismisses the creed of the Buddha as not being a complete mysticism, which would be that of "action, creation, love". Buddhism, he says, (p. 241) has not ignored love, but it has lacked warmth, has not believed in the efficacy of human action, had no confidence in itself; and he finds this ardent love, "a mysticism comparable to the Christian," only in such comparatively, post-Christian examples as a Vivekananda or a Ramakrishna. He concludes (p. 242) by saying that "neither in Greece nor in ancient India has there been a complete mysticism sometimes because the *élan* was insufficient, sometimes because it was opposed by material circumstances or a too narrow intellectualism.

The definition of the true mysticism, too long to be quoted here, follows on pp. 250–1. This definition covers most essentials and is finally identified with the "*élan* itself, communicated in its integrity to some privileged men who then desire to impress it on the whole of humanity and, paradoxically, by a creative effort change this created thing that is a type of itself, move that which is by definition, in arrest". But will it succeed, he continues, amongst humanity "that species of animal, ruled by the animal law which condemns life to feed on life"; and the answer to that is a doubtful one. M. Bergson, indeed, demands as the condition of such success a drastic change in the world order, a raising of the level of intelligence, and liberation from machinery. He sees in conclusion "humanity trembling, half crushed by the weight of the progress it has made". "It does not sufficiently realise," he writes "that its future depends upon itself. It is for humanity to ask itself if it only wishes to live, or, beyond that to furnish the necessary effort in the accomplishment on this refractory planet, of the essential function of the universe, which is a machine to make gods".

This, very briefly, is M. Bergson's exposition of the two sources of Morality and Religion.

The first source is the pressure exercised by society, the necessity for men and women who live in close relation to one another, of formulating that law of self-protection, which according to Nietzsche is the single origin of dogmatic religion. But with his examination of the second source, M. Bergson, as we have seen, goes a step further and postulates the probability of a further inspiration coming in effect from outside, and working through those rare responsive individuals (les âmes qui s'ouvrent), whom we know as the mystics.

And with much of this we can very willingly agree. M. Bergson has intimated hesitatingly, at times almost reluctantly, an approach to those truths which constitute the familiar knowledge of the Ancient Wisdom. He has shown himself in this as in his earlier works, a philosopher who has refused to be confined by tradition and scholarship in that closed circle to which he makes such frequent reference in the present work. He has, it is true, no message to give to the readers of THE ARYAN PATH, but it is interesting and instructive to find a philosopher of his type, arriving by a devious and painstaking route at the verge of those conclusions which formulate our own premises. If he has been unable to go still further, to reach the full realisation of the true meaning of the inexplicable, and in some cases self-contradictory, attributes of his own Elan Vital, we may attribute the failure, in his own words, to "les circumstances naturelles" and an "intellectualité trop étroite".

J. D. BERESFORD

MUSLIM ESOTERICISM*

[Hugh I'A. Fausset writes with understanding and impartiality on Islamic Mysticism and offers some thoughts of practical value in the present state of tension between Hindus and Muslims.—EDS.]

The seven essays contained in this book were originally published in a limited edition thirty years ago and their re-issue is to be welcomed because they deal primarily with a side of Muhammadanism which has received too little attention, at least in the West, namely its mystical side. 'Tasawwuf,' the Islamic name for the ecstatic state, is a subject, as Mr. Khan remarks, 'that people fear to teach from a public platform'. And this fear is very reasonable and right. For the nearer we approach to the heart of the religious experience, the less are we inclined to talk about it, to preach or to proselytize. 'The bee buzzes,' it has been said, 'when it is

* *The Philosophy of Islam*. By Khan Sahib KHAJA KHAN. B. A. (The Hogarth Press, Madras. 2s. 6d.)

outside the flower, but within the chalice, it drinks honey silently'. And those who have come nearest to reality, who have realized it within their being, know that the secret of it cannot be proclaimed from the pulpit. An intimacy of personal contact is required for its communication and often it is not so much through words as through the subtle pulsations of a living presence, the direct infusion of a spirit that is at one with all Spirit, that the liberating light of truth is transmitted to those who are ripe for responding to it. Mr. Khan who quotes the Islamic saying—'He who understood God has his tongue tied'—is well aware of this, but he admits that the duty of some liberated men may well be to guide their 'straying brethren'. And I would go further than he does and suggest that the time has come when much of the esoteric knowledge, so closely and jealously guarded in the past, may be made public. Readers of THE ARYAN PATH need not be reminded that Madame Blavatsky was a pioneer in this difficult and necessary work, and there is no reason to believe that the effects of her research have been anything but beneficial. Not that I would underestimate the dangers of broadcasting the details of occult practices. But so much half-knowledge of the subject is already prevalent that pseudo-science can now only be corrected by true science. Even now the deepest and most potent knowledge cannot be entrusted to any who have not advanced so far along the path of their purification as to be incapable of abusing it. But since occultism is no more and no less than the science of supra-physical, and since the quest of man for knowledge has now reached the point when the physical world is dissolving into something immaterial, his advance into subtler regions of the Spirit cannot obviously be arrested. Knowledge is in fact always dangerous; it may lead to the greatest good or the greatest harm, as the history of the development of natural science in the West during the last hundred years so lamentably shows. But it is man's destiny to *know*, in order that he may more truly *be*. Again it is his destiny to *be* that he may more truly *know*. And it cannot be emphasized too strongly that the latter condition governs unalterably the profitable pursuit of occult science. Only the mystic, the man who is striving courageously and consistently after selflessness and the deepening and transformation of the inner life, can afford to study, still more to practise the occult. But for such a man it may prove as valuable and necessary a science of the soul, as the science of the body is for the man who would cultivate physical health.

But the digression into which I have been led has taken me rather far from Mr. Khan who disclaims in his preface any intention of discussing the inner nature or mechanism of the mystical state. His predominant purpose, in his own words, ' is to show in the man-

ner of Euclid's point what Tasawwuf is not, rather than what it is' and particularly to refute 'certain nebulous ideas of Tasawwuf which are nothing more than Vedantic doctrines and Grecian aphorisms'. Since the very word Tasawwuf did not come into existence till about the end of the second century of the Hejira, and since an unwritten law, which permits the Sufi writers to quote hadithes without citing chapter and verse, has resulted in many spurious hadithes being incorporated into Tasawwuf, the task he has set himself of purifying Islamic doctrine of foreign and dubious additions is no easy one. Nor is it a task which can interest greatly any but the devout Musalman or those who are making a special study of Islam. At times, indeed his essays are so overburdened with interpretation of specific words and phrases as to become little more than a glossary of Islamic terms, while in his analysis of rival schools of thought and doctrine he is necessarily concerned with that aspect of religion which for the reader who has freed himself from the fetters of organized creeds is the least edifying, even if such a one admits that crucial matters of belief underlay what are often quibbling differences.

But Mr. Khan is a convinced Muhammadan, who applauds the rhetorical question addressed by Sir Saiyid Ahmad to the students of the Aligarh College,—"What is it to us, if you become the stars of heaven, when you have shaken off Islam ?" His chief purpose is therefore to restore and purify the faith of his fathers and recall to it those young Muhammadans who are lapsing from its stricter rule. But he is not forgetful too of a wider audience. Hence he has 'tried to show in some places that Islamic doctrines and practices, if probed deeply, would be found to have the support of the best and most earnest thinkers of the West.' He is of course perfectly secure in making this claim. But it might be made with equal justice of each of the historical religions of mankind. In all of them, if we probe deeply enough, we find the same mysteries revealed, the same rules of conduct prescribed, the same path of salvation sought. But in Muhammadanism, as in Christianity, these profound and constant truths are overlaid, if not perverted, by exclusive claims and dogmas which 'the best and most earnest thinkers' of to-day cannot for a moment accept even if they admit that a symbolic significance can be read into the contested facts. I need only cite two passages from Mr. Khan's exposition of his Faith to show what I mean. 'It is claimed,' he writes, 'that perfect evolution from plurality to unity was gained by one only, the most perfect representative, the "perfect man" as he is called, *viz.*, Muhammad the Prophet.' And again: 'The Prophet had concentrated in him all the attributes that inhere in the choicest individuals of the human race.'

Certainly Muhammad must always rank high in the hierarchy of inspired prophets and religious reformers, but there can be few who have studied his life and personality disinterestedly who will not consider such claims as the above to be idolatry. That Christians make even more exalted claims for Jesus of Nazareth is of course equally true. But their idolatry has at least the justification of a life, so far as we know it, of unexampled purity and blamelessness. While, therefore, it is possible to sympathise with Mr. Khan's determination to admit as genuine in Islamic philosophy only such thoughts and doctrines as can be traced to its founder, his insistence that the Prophet was the only 'Perfect Man,' the one centre in which Divinity and humanity met, reflects that combative and exclusive stage in the development of religious consciousness which humanity, we may well hope, has almost outgrown.

A sectarian prejudice is also evident in various acrimonious references which he makes to Hinduism and Buddhism. For example he writes,—'In Hinduism you stand at the threshold and get a sideway glimpse from afar of a Divinity that appears to be impersonal. In Buddhism after travelling long and uphill, you lift the veil; and the eyes are so dazzled that you behold a nullity—a mere zero. In Islam you have a personal God, a God that possesses all the attributes of perfection and is devoid of all the attributes of imperfection.' And elsewhere he refers disparagingly to 'the Nihilistic philosophy of Buddha and Sankara'.

To any one who has studied the Vedanta or the teaching of Buddha closely, such sentences as these must seem little better than caricatures of the spiritual wisdom which they reveal. And Mr. Khan's prejudice would seem to be traceable not only to that rather crude monotheism which was the very dynamic of early Muhammadanism in its conflict with a prevalent polytheism, but to the fact that it derived much of its later and more subtle mystical knowledge from the Hindus. To quote his own words, 'When the Muslims travelled Eastward and settled in India, their philosophical belief received a good deal of accretions from the Vedanta School. 'It is these accretions which he is most anxious to purge away. Yet his description of many of the mystical tenets of Sufism shows that they correspond closely to the purest doctrine of Vedanta, and I would be more convinced by his claim that they are indigenous, if he did not so grossly distort the religions which he wishes to disown. I have not space here to discuss the vexed question of monotheism and pantheism, but merely to dismiss Hinduism as pantheistic without any real understanding of what spiritual pantheism involves is an unjust and high-handed proceeding. Mr. Khan contrasts the Muhammadan and the Hindu view of the divine immanence in

the following sentence,—'In the one travel to God appears a mode of motion in knowledge from the coarse material to spiritual contemplation, when a tajalli or illumination of God appears in the Salik; while in the other it is an incarnation of God—God himself appearing in flesh for the salvation of humanity'. But more shortly his contention is that the Musalman believes that he can attain to be one with God, the Hindu that he can become God. Yet no informed student of the Upanishads would admit so crude a contrast. For if the essential identity of Atman and Brahman is the central theme of the Upanishads, it is balanced no less emphatically by a realization that God, in Professor Radhakrishnan's words, 'is greater than the Universe, which is His work. He is as much and more beyond this, as the human personality is beyond the body, which is the instrument of its life here'. Deity, in short, is transcendent as well as immanent. It exceeds the ability of even the purest soul to realize It completely.

I cannot help feeling that such a conception of God escapes the dangers of pantheism quite as successfully as that of the strict Muhammadan does and without falling, as the latter, judged by Mr. Khan would seem to do, into the personal prejudice and limitations of an anxious and suspicious monotheism. Although in fact Khan's essays are valuable in showing how much unexpected mysticism and esoteric meaning are to be found in Islam, the impression remains that its real genius is of a practical and moral nature, closely akin to Judaism. It is not without significance that the annual compulsory pilgrimage to Mecca was not instituted wholly for spiritual ends. As Mr. Khan can proudly claim,—'It practically teaches the benefits of travelling and trading, for unlike the Hindu pilgrim the Muslim pilgrim is permitted to traffic'. Like all great religions Islam teaches, of course, submission to the will of God and ultimate extinction of one's will in His will, but for it that consummation so devoutly to be wished for is to be attained primarily by direct and forthright methods. Conceived as the religion of an active, hot-blooded, and war-like methods, it has preserved its strength and simplicity at the cost of subtler spiritual wisdom. Its personal God has reflected the intrepid and aggressive personalities who bowed down daily before Him. It has been on the whole hostile to asceticism and speculations because its devotees have lived so ardently the life of the body and have been so conscious of and ready to meet the demands of the physical world. Yet its this-worldliness has been rooted in a passionate conviction of the unity of God and of the necessity of 'burning one's self before the One'. And this fundamental and interior mysticism as Mr. Khan shows, has been developed and refined by many sensitive spirits among the later followers of the Prophet, who have crystallized it in a body of esoteric knowledge comparable in value to that of the other religions of the East. Mr. Khan's essays are to be welcomed because they emphasise this frequently overlooked fact, but they would be more illuminating if he had been more ready to discover the spiritual truths which Muhammadanism shares with Hinduism and Buddhism instead of contrasting the virtues of his own Faith with the vices of other Faiths which he imperfectly understands.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

The Keys of Power—A Study of Indian Ritual and Belief. By J. ABBOTT, I. C. S. With numerous diagrams. (Methuen & Co. 21s.)

With an insight, sympathetic understanding, scrupulously selected and stated detail, Mr. J. Abbott has prepared surely for the purpose of consumption by a Western audience of readers an account of the various rituals performed by Hindus and Mohamedans from season to season. These owe their origin to a congenital belief that affairs of life and death, adjustment to the conditions of existence in a given life and to anticipations of future, and a general regulation of behaviour are firmly grounded on the dominance of the physical by the superphysical, and that objects are endowed with a peculiar power (*Sakti*) for good or evil. Hindus and Mohamedans believe in the existence and active operation of this mysterious power and model their daily religious and spiritual conduct so as to enlist the power for good in their services and avoid the power for evil. An orthodox Hindu unsophisticated by critical rationalism has to cover a programme of rituals commencing from sunrise and ending with sunset. There is a daily programme to be gone through (*Nitya-Karma*) and on special occasions elaborate special rituals have to be performed (*Naimittika-karma*). Birth, and Death, Wedding, Eclipses, New Moon, Full Moon, etc., reveal rituals that are concomitant with them. There is no unbridgeable gulf between the physical and the superphysical, between the finite and the Infinite; in virtue of the Immanence of the Spirit, the natural, or the finite creation is endowed with a peculiar power for good or evil, and it is held that a carefully performed ritual is just a key which would unlock massive doors and release power.

Thus Mr. Abbott deals with the Powers of Animals and Trees, of Man, and Woman; of Evil Eye, Water, Fire, Ground, Metals, Salt; of Stones, Time, Colours, Numbers, Sweet Things, Grain, Bread, etc., in different chapters. While it is obviously impossible to emphasise the many details of Hindu and Mohamedan rituals referred to by Mr. Abbott it is necessary to draw the attention of your readers to a few samples. (1) "A man's innate power is greatest when his shadow is longest" . . . Smell and saliva, shadow, nails, hair, are concerned with power. It is some consolation to learn that "A madman may actually be saint, if not a saint he is possessed by spirits . . ." (2) "A woman when *enceinte* has special power." (3) "Water keeps away spirits. . . . .Water is used in many ways in the strict ritual of bestowing a gift." The festivals of Holi and Deepavali are described. The power of Time is indeed tremendous and fractions of a Day, Days, Months, etc., are not neutral and colourless but are either auspicious or inauspicious. "The New Moon day is *ghoro* to the Muhammadan and a *parvakal* to the Hindu." "One is an ominous number. Two is associated

with *barkat*, etc." "Trees are often the abode of spirits." "Particular spirits and ghosts haunt particular trees." "A Muhammadan considers a donkey an accursed animal. . . . ." "If a pregnant woman sees asses mating, her children will be born strong." "According to both Muhammadan and Hindu belief, spirits are a creation apart . . . Spirits propagate and are very fertile. . . . . Spirits bring evil to man." In the concluding chapter, Mr. Abbott enumerates certain factors that involve or bring about destruction of power. Appendix A contains a list of Hindu and Mohamedan charms.

Ex pede Herculem. The fact is obvious that Mr. Abbott has taken considerable pains to collect the minute details of Hindu and Mohamedan rituals, and presented them in a systematic manner. On the whole Mr. Abbott's command of the rather intricate Sanskrit terminology is indeed very commendable but here and there are inaccuracies which only demonstrate the difficulty of the Hindu ritualistic and linguistic details being mastered by a foreigner however sympathetic and however patient he may be; thus: (1) On page 187, line 2, from the bottom, the correct term used should have been "Adharani" and not as actually printed. (2) On page 47, what Mr. Abbott describes to be "Navrasinam" should as a matter of fact be taken to be "Nakshatra-nama", as the names are modelled on constellations and *not* on zodiacal signs. (3) On page 4, the term "Prithivipata" in the first line is wrong. It should be "Prithivipatih". (4) Mr. Abbott writes that the "God Sankara is supposed to have killed a demon called "*Tripurari*" (italics mine, Page 203, last line) but unfortunately, the term "Tripurari" is applied to Sankara the God and not to the demon. The demon is known as "Tripura" or "Tripurasura". (5) On page 349, the Sanskrit expression in the 8th line as it stands is inaccurate. It should read thus—"Vastram or vastrani samarpayami". (6) And again on page 466, line 20, when Mr. Abbott renders the expression "Mantradhinam tu Daivatam" into the "mantras *are* gods." (italics mine) he is clearly mistaken. The correct rendering would be "Gods are under the power of or subservient to Mantras".

It is an undeniable fact that the life of a Hindu is concerned with a number of rituals, and for their correct and accurate portraiture Mr. Abbott deserves the thanks of all interested in bringing about a better understanding between the East and the West in general and in particular of those interested in anthropological investigations. It would however be a terrible mistake to believe that the rituals *dominate* in any vital sense the life and conduct of modern Hindus with or without the benefits of English education. Gautama in his "Dharma Sutras" (Chapter 8) makes it perfectly clear that a Hindu has to go through a programme of forty rituals, (chatvarimsat-samskara) but, the rituals by themselves, however faultlessly performed, are unable to guarantee the riddance of ills that flesh and spirit are heir to. A well regulated and disciplined life lived according to the canons and standards of moral sensibility the mainspring of which is the spirit of service and sacrifice grounded on disinterested love, (Gautama seeks to sum up the moral requirements under the highly suggestive term "Atma-Guna,") is bound to rank higher any day in any scheme of rational evaluation. That is Gautama's position. When confronted with a moral situation involving a conflict between the rituals, (samskaras) and moral qualities, (atma-gunas) a rational and responsible subject will have absolutely no difficulty in showing rituals their proper place and rejecting their claims.

I am not quite sure if Mr. Abbott holds the view that the life of an average Hindu was ever pre-eminently ritual-ridden or continues to be so ritual-ridden even at the present day; but the fact should never be lost sight of that rituals are always subordinated to higher moral values. It is psychologically easy to look askance at rituals and ritualism, but, having rejected religious rituals, the modern civilised nations have taken with gusto to a scheme of secular ritualism under cover of rationalism! Bureaucratic red-tapism, political and commercial exploitation, competition and victimisation are all manifestations of secular ritualism. If Mr. Abbott has no quarrel with the latter he could have none either with the scheme of Indian ritual and belief. I feel convinced that Mr. Abbott's excellent volume is bound to satisfy an anthropological need. He has done his work so well that readers and reviewers would feel that it could hardly have fallen into better hands.

R. NAGA RAJA SARMA

The Number Key to Ancient Wisdom. A Handbook Expository of the Principles of the Astronomical Wisdom-Doctrine in Greek and Hebrew Cryptography. By J. W. T. CARRINGTON. (Houghton Publishing Co., London. 5*s*.)

Mr. Carrington sets out to show that

> by the method detailed in this handbook, there will be disclosed as attaching to letter combinations in the Hebrew and Greek alphabets significances so mutually harmonious as to outline a system of transcendental philosophy that is consistent as well as profound.

This very ambitious aim is not realised.

The application of Kabalistic methods of interpretation to the Hebrew scriptures is an extremely controversial question. That meanings were sometimes deliberately concealed from the uninitiated by means of ciphers based on the numerical values of Hebrew words seems to be certain; but the extent to which this was done was probably more limited than is usually claimed, and many of the examples given in such works as Macgregor Mathers' *Kabbalah Unveiled* are singularly unconvincing.

Whether numerical ciphers were used in Greek, in which language as in Hebrew each letter stands for a number, has been disputed. Dr. Wynn Westcott, in his book on *Numbers*, appears to think not. He speaks of the "bastard Greek Kabalah" formed in the Middle Ages on the Hebrew model. On the other hand, Mr. James M. Pryse, in his *Apocalypse Unsealed*, has adduced some very striking instances of the use of a numerical cipher in that work; and it seems probable that Jewish writers, like the author of the *Apocalypse*, did occasionally adapt the methods of the Kabalah to Greek when writing in that language.

Mr. Carrington lays down certain rules for the numerical analysis of Greek and Hebrew words; but he does not tell us where they come from or why we should accept them as valid. His leading principle is that "the significance of a number is the combination of the separate significances . . . . of the several factors of the number . . "

This would seem to be a novel principle in Kabalistic exegesis and to be quite distinct from either of the well-known methods called respectively Gematria, Notaricon and Temura.

The greater part of the present work is devoted to an account of the significances which Mr. Carrington thinks should be attributed to various numbers. Some of these are traditional and interesting; but the majority appear to be entirely arbitrary and without point. Such information, for example, as that 181 is the numerical value of *eirene* (peace), in Greek; 182, of the name, Jacob, in Hebrew; 195, the "total of the stripes received by St. Paul"; and the like, is scarcely worth recording in print.

It would be easier to follow Mr. Carrington's thought if he would simplify his terribly involved style and curb his tendency to coin awkward and unnecessary words.

R. A. V. M.

Man and Technics. By OSWALD SPENGLER. (Allen & Unwin. 6s.)

Technics, according to Spengler, is not to be understood in terms of implements. It signifies the whole tactics of living, and includes all methods, of whatsoever kind, employed by life in its conflict with Nature.

Technics, therefore, is coeval with life. However, among plants, life is only a theatre for the activities of the sun and light. It is with animals that a certain measure of independence against Nature is achieved for the first time. Of animals there are two kinds: the herbivores which feed on the immobile plant world are inferior to the beasts of prey which have to hunt and kill their food before they can eat it. Man is a beast of prey.

Yet there is a vast difference between man and all other animals. Their technics is generic, impersonal, unalterable. Man alone selects his technics, and what is more, makes it, and makes it in accordance with individual needs. He has wrested the privilege of creation from Nature. That is why he is the rebel. He has set Art in opposition to Nature. How was he enabled to do it? Through the simultaneous genesis of the hand and the tool. At a later stage, speech and enterprise are born. They make it possible for man to abandon his own weapons and his own tactics in the daily struggle to combine with others for collective action. A culture thus comes into existence. It requires a distinction between the activities of thought and the activities of the hand. Mental activity must precede and direct executive activity. Mind therefore gains the ascendancy. But both mental worker and manual labourer become, body and soul, parts of a higher organisation and incur an enormous loss of freedom.

That is the story of every culture. Western or Faustian culture is unique. All former cultures were content to make use of plants and animals, and rob Nature of her treasures of wood and mineral. Western culture seeks to supplant Nature. "To build a world oneself, to be oneself God—that is the Faustian inventor's dream, and from it has sprung all our designing and redesigning of machines to approximate as nearly as possible to the unattainable limit of perpetual motion."

But the actual is necessarily the transient. Everything born must die. Western civilization must die and the signs of its collapse are increasing: the machine, by its multiplicity and refinement, is defeating its own purpose; the leader is turning away from practical occupations to pure speculation; and, above all, machine technology has been taught to non-European peoples to whom it is not an inward, vital necessity. Machine technics will end with Faustian man. "Faced as we are with this destiny, there is only one world-outlook that is worthy of us . . . . . better a short life, full of deeds and glory than a long life without content." Let us eat and drink and be merry, for to-morrow we die.

It will be gathered from the above summary that Spengler conceives of history as a series of increasingly audacious but invariably unsuccessful rebellions against Nature—a series of which the successive stages are: animal, man, and the various cultures culminating in Faustian culture. For the reactionary implications of this philosophy as it bears on social policy and personal conduct, I must refer the reader to Spengler's book. I can only make two observations here. I think it is an anthropomorphical fallacy to treat a culture as though it possessed the unity and reality ascribable to the individual man, and to discuss it in terms of life and death and destiny. Can any one say whether Greek culture is alive or dead? Is Indian culture extinct? In the second place, it is difficult to admit, considering the trend of modern scientific thought, that there is an essential antagonism between Nature and Life or Mind. Scornfully though he writes of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Spengler's own outlook is, like theirs, profoundly materialistic.

K. S. SHELVANKAR

The Conflict of the Individual and the Mass in the Modern World. By EVERETT DEAN MARTIN. (Henry Holt & Company, New York.)

It is one thing to recognize the defects of Western civilization, another to assign them to their proper causes and still a third to suggest the remedy. In this volume, the infirmities of democracy, as it has developed in the West, are ably diagnosed, but the tracing of their causes is somewhat less convincing and the prescription for their cure is weak.

Two evils Mr. Martin finds outstanding, paradoxical as their concurrence may seem. These are the jealous attempt of the infantile many to prevent the emergence of mature individuals from the mass, and, existing side by side with it, the general overstimulation of personal ambition in the direction of material success. The levelling down resulting from their interplay means the dominance of second-rate individuals in society and the triumph of mediocrity all along the line. The more sinister aspect of the widespread confusion of progress with prosperity is the rampant growth and increasing urgency of the concrete demands upon life by more and more people, quite irrespective of the ability of civilization to meet the demands of all and—a point Mr. Martin fails to make—of the deserts of those making them. He gives a nightmare metaphor of the situation: "We are like passengers on a train speeding through the dark, with an ever-accelerating pace and without a headlight."

"Crowd-mindedness" is the scapegoat in Mr. Martin's opinion. He succeeds in laying upon it many of the shortcomings of modern democracy, but his thesis falls short of an adequate plan for banishing it from the community. He advises learning to recognize the symptoms of crowd mentality, that we may be on our guard against it, and proposes as cure for it the development of habits of critical thinking, skepticism, and doubt, learning to face the facts about ourselves, and distinguishing clearly between real and fictitious personal superiority. The rationale of these steps he leaves largely to the imagination.

Four elements in our civilization are cited as directly contributory to crowd-mentality and the submergence of the individual in the mass. One of these is mass production, the psychological effect of which has been to vulgarize the values of civilization. Mr. Martin denies that our modern industrialism, in spite of its material advantages, really makes easier the struggle to live, any more than the multiplication of machine-made goods adds to the deeper satisfactions of mankind.

And just as industrialism, by reducing the individual worker to a mere numerical unit, depersonalizes a man's relations to his fellows and to his work, the political machinery tends to reduce personality to a minimum. The State is shown as the successor of the mediæval Church, representing on the whole an advance over it, and the cult of the State as filling in many ways the place formerly occupied by orthodox religion. The soulless mechanism of the modern State, however, places leadership in the hands of the numerical majority, whereas the mediæval Church did recognize the fact of spiritual inequality and provided for the leadership of those considered the best.

The self-idolatry of the mass under modern democracy means still further minimizing of personal worth. With the growing ascendance of the insignificant, Mr. Martin sees culture and all values except the material declining rapidly, a narrow nationalism or class consciousness and a comfortable and unreflective optimism prevailing, while ethics becomes a matter of taboos.

The philosophy of Naturalism, which Mr. Martin presents as materialism pure and simple, is analyzed as on a par with the other causal factors, but surely more of the evils of present-day democracy are to be laid at the door of a materialistic philosophy of life than can be charged to the others. Much as the author deplores the common acceptance of being modern as the criterion of being

right, frankly as he admits the spiritual cost of Naturalism, he yet is too much under the domination of such thinkers as Bertrand Russell to repudiate the materialistic hypothesis. He pays lip homage to the new scientific spirit of the 18th and 19th centuries as "the greatest and most promising leap forward that humanity had yet made," but he is keenly alive to the values sacrificed by the logicians. He cannot escape their reasoning, but his intuition obviously rebels against its implications and he looks back half regretfully from the bleak negation of Naturalism to the outgrown superstitions of mediæval Christianity. But bitter as he finds the fruit of materialistic logic, he yet fears its loss in the event of a throwback to some sort of evangelicalism, which he sees as a not unlikely cyclic development.

Like many another reluctant convert to materialism, Mr. Martin seems unable to visualize a possible middle ground between materialism and superstition, or to recognize that the facts adduced by modern science are susceptible of quite another interpretation than its votaries offer, namely, that found in the philosophy of the ancient Aryans, satisfying alike to reason and intuition and endowing life with purpose and meaning, which in Mr. Martin's scheme it sadly lacks.

Ph. D.

Erewhon and Erewhon Revisited. By SAMUEL BUTLER. (Everyman's Library, J. M. Dent & Sons.)

Samuel Butler was perhaps not among the greatest Victorians, but he was certainly, as he described himself, the *enfant terrible* of the age. Churchmen and scientists, the bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia alike found in him a powerful and mordant critic whose shafts drove home none the less effectively because they lacked the vehement, prophetic energy of a Carlyle or the expert authority of a Huxley. Though painting was his chosen vocation, it is as an author that he is remembered. His vigorous and versatile mind continually led him to combat what he considered to be the errors of his time, and of his books one or two have gained a permanent place in English literature.

Erewhon has been compared with *Gulliver's Travels* for its satire, but apart from its exquisite ridicule of the Established Churches—under the name of Musical Banks, which deal in a sort of toy money; "of course every one knew that their commercial value was *nil*, but all those who wished to be considered respectable thought it incumbent upon them to retain a few coins in their possession, and to let them be seen from time to time . . . . ."—apart from this, its interest for us lies rather in its brilliant anticipation of ideas and problems which are very much to the fore in our own day; in its recognition of the vegetable kingdom as being as truly alive and sensitive as men and animals; in its insistence that legal "punishment" should be in the nature of medical or psychopathic treatment; and above all, in its prescience of what we realise now to be an actual danger, the tyranny of the machine. In the interest of their souls, the Erewhonians are finally obliged to destroy all mechanical inventions produced after a certain date!

Erewhon Revisited has an organic unity wanting in the earlier book; its theme is the re-appearance of the founder of a religion among the people who profess to follow him, and the embarrassments caused thereby. Of more value than the satire, as Mr. Desmond McCarthy points out in an admirable introduction to this volume, are the sermons and dialogues interpolated through the narrative. They contain a statement of Butler's view that immortality means not the survival of man as a separate entity but the persistence of his influence on succeeding generations.

K. S. S.

Mencius on the Mind, Experiments in Multiple Definition. By I. A. RICHARDS. (Kegan Paul, London. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

This is a strange book. Dr. Richards, however, embarks upon his novel thesis with the determination of a pioneer. He wants nothing less than to make us *word*-conscious. We have been using our words, he says, for twenty thousand years at least (perhaps a million) *incuriously*, as primitive man used his sticks and stones, his animals and plants. Now, in this generation, we are becoming more and more self-conscious, sex-conscious, race-conscious, and world-conscious; so we ought to become *word*-conscious too.

That is the point of Dr. Richards' most interesting book. He builds up an argument round the psychological teaching of Mencius because he refers, especially, to the problems of Sino-European interpretation. Neither Chinese nor European languages and mentality are being satisfactorily conveyed across the intervening barriers of space and time—to the mutual disadvantage of either side. The problem of multiple definitions in dealing with words, and the ideas they symbolise, has thus intruded itself very keenly on Dr. Richards! But Mencius, the great moralist of the fourth century B. C., *the Second Sage* (after Confucius) of China, is merely a peg upon which to hang a varied assortment of suggestions for the development of psychological word-consciousness.

Certain passages from Mencius are printed as an Appendix with alternative English renderings under the Chinese words. The preceding chapters tackle the problems (*a*) of translation from the Chinese into a European tongue, (*b*) of all translation in general. With that, there is a suggested technique for comparative studies.

The difficulty in our dealings one with another, Europeans with Chinese, is the barrier of different modes of thought, and consequently, a different use of words. Dr. Richards ably puts it thus :—

> To a mind formed by modern Western training, the interpretation of the Chinese Classics seems often an adventure among possibilities of thought and feeling rather than an encounter with facts.

The whole approach to the use of words in China is fundamentally different from our own.

The force of a single word in the Chinese is more dependent on the rest of the phrase and the general context than is usual in Western languages. Hence the mystery as to how good Chinese scholars decide which meanings are or are not admissible.

> One gets the impression that an unwritten and unelucidatable tradition accompanies and directs their interpretation. It is as though the text were only a bare fragmentary notation—to be supplemented out of a store of unrecorded knowledge—much as a music score may receive a special interpretation handed down in and through a school.

The difficulty will not get less with time. The number of persons equipped to-day with a *purely* Chinese scholarship is rapidly diminishing. Before long, there will be nobody studying Mencius into whose mind philosophical and other ideas of modern Western origin have not made their way. The Chinese scholar of the near future will not be intellectually much nearer Mencius than any Western pupil of Aristotle and Kant. "Unless the thinking which has been fundamental to historic China can somehow be explained in Western terms, it seems inevitably doomed to oblivion."

The other side must be considered too. There is an even graver urgency there. We have been discovering during the last century how much we lost through Greek ideas coming into post-Renaissance currency in poor or inaccurate translations. Our whole system of theology has been vitiated by conscious or unconscious mistranslation. Similar avoidable accidents on a vastly greater scale threaten the new language of modern China. An enormous crop of

> maladjusted hybrid meanings—from the crossing of our ambiguities with Chinese ambiguities—seems certain to be perpetuated in language to the unnecessary distress and confusion of many generations. *Unless*, that is, a deliberately revised technique for recording

and comparing the ranges of our words and their words can be brought into action *in time*.

Dr. Richards applies himself nobly to the task. But he is only a pioneer. May we suggest that the proper person to build the next section of the bridge is an Indian scholar? Geographically he would be well-placed. Long association with European tongues, and roots far sunk into a common Aryan past, enable him to approach our side with competent understanding. On the other hand, his Oriental mentality and his training in the approach to psychological and intellectual problems in the silence of cosmic *communion* bring him nearer to China than we can hope, as a rule, to be. The word *ch'i*, so imrtapont to Chinese esoteric texts, can surely best be explained by an Indian student familiar with the meaning and workings of the breath. An Indian, too, is more qualified to explain fully to the Western mind the Chinese moral attitude to the self. There is no officially recognised war in the Chinese mind between the Soul and the Body, between will and desire—hence that absence of a sense of sin which used to puzzle all the missionaries.

No—to understand Mencius, and often in other sorts of translation, we must perhaps efface our whole tradition of thinking and learn another. What is needed, is "greater imaginative resource in a double venture—in imagining other purposes than our own and other structures for the thought that serves them".

R. A. L. ARMSTRONG

The Devil's Camera. By R. G. BURNETT and E. D. MARTELL. (The Epworth Press, London. 1*s.*)

The Cinema, everyone admits, is a powerful influence in modern life, but it is perhaps not equally widely recognized that its effects have so far been more harmful than beneficial. From a purely intellectual point of view, the majority of films "released" each week are crude and brainless productions. Considered in their general social context, the case against them is more serious still. In spite of themselves—for the Cinema industry has shown little concern for standards other than technical—they propagate ethical and cultural values, and the values they have hitherto propagated will not bear examination. They will be disclaimed by most men in their reflective moments; their deficiency in the light of some high religious or moral ideal need scarcely be discussed.

The main indictment against the Cinema is that it employs its enormous powers of portrayal and suggestion to surround with glamour things which are essentially sordid and tedious, as all but the most callow will admit—things like lust and crime and war. These are no doubt part of the stuff of life as we know it, and art cannot exclude them, but *art* will give them meaning—it will set them in their perspective; it will interpret them in terms of a larger idea. Such art the Cinema most decidedly lacks, and lacking it, it becomes, inevitably, in its present state, a systematic incitement to lechery and murder.

While exposing and denouncing, with much factual detail, these aspects of the Cinema, Messrs. Burnett and Martell are not blind to its possibilities. They recognize that several films recently shown offer entertainment which does not degrade and education which does not bore the public. They only insist that professional critics are not sufficiently alive to their responsibilities and do not make the emphatic protests necessary at the appearance of pernicious films. For the rest, they contend that the Protestant Churches have let slip an opportunity of influencing the public on religious lines, which it is not too late too retrieve. Whether it is desirable to depict religion as something pictorial, or legendary and narrative, they do not stop to consider.

K. S. S.

I Lost My Memory: The Case as the Patient Saw It. (Faber and Faber, London. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

The "Patient," whose name is withheld for obvious reasons, is understood to be a well-known writer on scientific subjects. His story begins with the war, in which he served as an officer and was several times wounded. While in hospital in 1916, he became engaged to a lady on the nursing staff, whom he afterwards married. When the war came to an end, he was appointed to the teaching staff of one of the English Universities, a position which he held until 1930. In the mean time, he tells us, "the hospital romance . . . . had not been altogether a success. The marriage had continued through varying fortunes for thirteen years, when it had ended in an undefended suit for divorce, in which I had been respondent". As a result of this suit the "Patient" lost his job. The early months of 1931 saw him re-married, in monetary straits owing to unemployment, with the painful experiences of his first marriage fresh and pungent in his memory, and beset with anxiety as to how he might rebuild his shattered career.

One morning he went out of his boarding-house to buy some tobacco; and the next thing he was aware of was that he was wandering about, dirty and unshaven, many miles from home. He got in touch with the police, and through them with his wife. It appeared that three days had elapsed since his disappearance; and that he had lost all memory, not only of these days, but of the nineteen years that preceded them. His wife, who came to fetch him home, seemed to him to be a complete stranger; the war, his marriages, his academical work, and his financial and other worries, were all forgotten.

The book tells us in considerable detail how, with the aid of his wife and a very sympathetic and understanding doctor, he gradually recovered his memory of the lost nineteen years. For many months, while the treatment was going on, the "Patient's" mind was the scene of a desperate struggle between his conscious self, trying its utmost to remember, and another, subconscious self that seemed determined he should never do so. As time went on, it appeared as though the loss of memory had been deliberately brought about by this other self in order to wipe out from the "Patient's" mind all the painful episodes of the past and especially those in which his first wife had played a part. Scenes and incidents, directly or remotely connected with her, were the last to be recovered. Even the horrible details of trench warfare proved easier to bring back to memory.

We could wish that the "Patient" had gone a little deeper in his analysis of his mental states. He makes it clear that the whole of his personal memory of the years between 1912 and 1931 had gone—scenes, people, incidents, the details of reading and study, were all obliterated. But what of that which we may venture to call the impersonal memory—the shape given to the mind by abstract thought, philosophy, aspiration? Between the ages of twenty and thirty-nine, an educated, thoughtful man, capable of introspective analysis, as the "Patient" assuredly is, must have worked out for himself a philosophy of life. He must have passed through religious experiences, even though he may have rejected religion in the narrower sense of the word. Were all these forgotten? Did he lapse back from the thought and experience-begotten philosophy of maturity to the cruder outlook of his youth? Was the inner life forgotten as well as the outer? His replies to these questions would be extremely interesting.

To understand loss of memory, we have first to know what memory itself is. In the opinion ordinarily current in the West, memory is entirely a matter of the physical brain. An action of consciousness is accompanied—or caused—by a movement in the cerebral substance. Revive this movement along the same nerve tracts, and you re-create the original state of consciousness. But Eastern Occultism has another story to tell.

Says H. P. Blavatsky

No manifestation . . . can ever be lost from the *Skandhic* record of a man's life. Not the smallest sensation, the most trifling action, impulse, thought, impression, or deed, can fade or go out from, or in the Universe. We may think it unregistered by our memory, unperceived by our consciousness, yet it will still be recorded on the tablets of the astral light. . . .There are cells in our brain that receive and convey sensations and impressions, but this once done, their mission is accomplished. These cells of the supposed 'organ of memory' are the *receivers* and *conveyers* of all the pictures and impressions of the past, not their *retainers*. Under various conditions and stimuli, they can receive instantaneously the reflection of these astral images back again, and this is called *memory, recollection, remembrance*: but they do not preserve them. When it is said that one has lost his memory, or that it is weakened, it is only a *façon de parler;* it is our memory-cells alone that are enfeebled or destroyed. The window glass allows us to see the sun, moon, stars, and all the objects outside clearly; crack the pane and all these outside images will be seen in a distorted way; break the window-pane altogether and replace it with a board, or draw the blind down, and the images will be shut out altogether from your sight. But can you say because of this, that all these images—sun, moon, and stars—have disappeared, or that by repairing the window with a new pane, the same will not be reflected again into your room? . . . . . The Universal Memory preserves every motion, the slightest wave and feeling that ripples the waves of differentiated nature, of man or of the Universe.—(*Lucifer* for Oct. 1891, p. 122)

In the case of the "Patient," his subconscious desire to escape from painful thought seems to have grown too strong to be controlled by his conscious self; and, once fully emancipated, it "pulled down the blind" and shut out the abhorrent memories. That our desire-driven lower nature can revolt successfully against the lordship of the higher, whose sceptre only too often is but feebly held, is a commonplace of experience; but the rebel in such cases, impelled by the longing to win pleasure or avoid pain, usually seeks to quench his thirst in stronger and more poisonous draughts than those that come from the river Lethe.

R. A. V. M.

Nicholas of Cusa. By HENRY BETT. (Methuen & Co. Ltd., London. *7s. 6d.*)

This book gives, quite impartially because quite unconsciously, proofs of the existence of the Theosophical Movement in Europe in the early fifteenth century. In fact it is only by proper comparison with other systems of thought that the reader will be able to get the full value from the book, able to see that the inconsistencies of which Mr. Bett accuses Nicholas exist only in his own mind.

Where the same aim, purpose and teaching are found there, consciously or unconsciously, in the same movement, despite outer differences of organisation and nomenclature. Universal Unity and Universal Truth are the two ideals of that Theosophical Movement. Let us turn then to Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa who lived in the transition period between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. His whole life and work was the practical application of his thought:

> The whole of his thought, political, philosophical, and theological alike, is marked by a persistent method of intellectual reconciliation and by a passion for unity. He was the advocate of unity in the political system of Europe; he was the apostle of unity amid the ecclesiastical dissensions of Christendom; and he was the philosopher of unity also, who consistently sought to see the beginning and the end of all things, the real essence and the real significance of all existence, as hidden in the super-essential Unity of God.

His metaphysical teaching tallies with the Universal Truths lying deep at the heart of every religion. That identity shines clearly even through Mr. Bett's occasional misconceptions,—for example, that of Christ as merely one particular Son of God—and other misunderstandings like that of the doctrine of evil, all of which are due to too limited an interpretation.

Nicholas wrote of the Nameless God, who can best be described by negations, being without attributes. Others have called It Parabrahm, Ain-Soph or Sat, the Causeless Cause of all.

> God is thus the aggregate (*complicatio*) of all things as the essential and eternal ground of their being. Things are the evolution (*explicatio*) of God, as the finite, multiple, differentiated development of what is grounded in Him, though in Him the finite is infinitude, the multiple is unity, and the difference is identity. There is, so to speak, one ultimate being, which may be viewed from two sides. On the higher side, it is One and Absolute, superexistent, the essence of all that is—God. On the lower side, it is multiple and relative, a derived and dependent existence, an evolution into the visible and the temporal—the universe.

The Secret Doctrine says:

> . . . . in Occult mataphysics there are, properly speaking, two "ONES"—the One on the unreachable plane of Absoluteness and "One" on the plane of Emanations....Parabrahm (the One Reality, the Absolute) is the field of Absolute Consciousness, *i. e.* that Essence which is out of all relation to conditioned existence, and of which conscious existence is a conditioned symbol. But once that we pass in thought from this (to us) Absolute Negation, duality supervenes in the contrast of Spirit (or consciousness) and Matter, Subject and Object. Spirit (or Consciousness) and Matter are, however, to be regarded, not as independent realities, but as the two facets or aspects of the Absolute (Parabrahm), which constitute the basis of conditioned Being whether subjective or objective.

This "coincidence of contraries" is also one of the central ideas of Nicholas. It finds its culmination in the statement that "The absolute maximum is therefore a unity that is all and in all, since it is the maximum. Because it has no opposite, it coincides with the minimum." Nicholas used very largely the mathematical symbols, of which the most important is the Hermetic one of Deity as an *infinite* circle whose circumference (the maximum) is nowhere, and whose centre (the minimum) is everywhere. Mr. Bett's objections to the coincidence of maximum and minimum only hold good of a *finite* circle. Similarly, the alleged inconsistency of using "explicatio" to denote the downward movement of life from perfection to imperfection, as well as the movement upward, can be explained by the motion of life being circular (to be more accurate, spiral), and therefore having not two different movements, but one. The concepts of Copernicus, with their world-waking effects, had their inception in the mathematical symbology of Nicholas of Cusa. Indeed, certain medieval kabalists held both persons to have been incarnations of the same being.

As in other systems, a triple rhythm runs through that of Nicholas, since everything existing is the microcosm of God as a tri-unity. Knowledge also, he teaches, is triune, though "The truth is absolute, and all knowledge is relative. There can be no exact measure for truth, except truth itself".

Space, however, will only allow one more quotation.

> Thus as an individual existence attains more unity, it fulfils its essential being more and more, and at the same time becomes less and less merely individual. So that the very apex of being is absolute unity, where the individual, as separate, ceases to be, and yet is more truly than ever, since the essential ground of every individual lies in the absolute unity.

And for that description of Nirvana, as well as for his rescue of the wisdom of Nicholas from obscurity, we must be grateful to Mr. Bett.

E. W.

Asiatic Mythology. A Detailed Description and Explanation of the Mythologies of all the Great Nations of Asia.—By J. HACKIN, Keeper of the Musée Guimet, Paris; C. H. MARCHAL; HENRI MASPERO; H. DE WILMAN-GRABOWSKA; SERGE ELISEEV; CLEMENT HUART; RAYMONDE LINOSSIER. With an Introduction by Paul-Louis Couchoud. Translated from the French by F. M. Atkinson. (George G. Harrap & Co., Ltd., London. 63*s.*)

We are told in the Introduction to this sumptuous and fascinating work that the scholars, who have collaborated in writing it, are all connected with the Musée Guimet of Paris that "incomparable museum of religions". The book is divided into sections, in which the respective mythologies of Persia, the Kāfirs, Indian Buddhism, Lamaism, Indo-China and Java, Central Asia, Modern China, Japan, are each described by an expert. Mr. Atkinson's work as translator has been done competently. The appeal of the book is rather to

the thoughtful "man in the street" than to the specialist: its intention is to introduce Asia to Europe, or in M. Couchoud's words, "to bring the two halves of humanity face to face". He goes on to say:

> On the very long and very winding road that by a slow ascent will lead us to the knowledge of Asia the study of mythology is the first stage, the indispensable rudiment, the ABC.
>
> It is through art that Asia first of all shows herself to us. Thousands of figured objects, prints, scrolls, statues—obsess our eyes. Through these we find ourselves in contact with an unknown world.
>
> All art is thought.
>
> The first condition necessary to understand a work of art in which a theme is treated is to know that theme. In Asia, as elsewhere, three-fourths of the subjects represented are religious. Hence we must begin by deciphering the mythology that inspires them . . . . . It is lazy fallacy to think that art can be appreciated apart from its subject. Indifference to the subject is mark of an ageing art. It appears among a sophisticated public to whom every subject has become commonplace and trite. It does not apply to periods of spontaneous and popular art. There everything is significant, everything speaks . . . . .

M. Couchoud and the school he represents have quite discarded the arrogant assumption of superiority and patronage that characterised most of the Victorian Orientalists. Their attitude towards the religions of Asia is both sympathetic and enlightened. Writes M. Couchoud:

> We Western peoples with our spirits still barbarian and too much caught up with what the philosophers call realism, we find it hard to comprehend the genesis of the gods. An invincible prepossession leads us to believe that God, the gods, the demons, are in things and outside ourselves. They are no such thing . . . .

He goes on to quote with approval the words of Bodhidharma, founder of Zen Buddhism, who told the Chinese Emperor, Leang Wu Ti:

> There is no Buddha outside the heart. Save the reality of the heart all is imaginary. The heart is Buddha, and Buddha is the heart. To conceive that he is seen in an external place is but delirium.

And the scriptures of East and West echo his words when they tell us:

> Seek in the impersonal for the 'Eternal man'; and having sought him out, look inward: thou art Buddha.
>
> The kingdom of heaven is within you.

If we contrast the words quoted above with the views expressed by the great writers on comparative religion of the last generation, we shall be in a position to appreciate the enormous change in the estimation of Eastern religions by Western scholars that has come about during the past fifty years. At the time when H. P. Blavatsky began to demonstrate in her writings the profound spiritual and even historical significance of the myths of the ancients, the attitude of European scholars was contemptuous, or at best patronising. Max Müller laid it down that mythology was "a disease of language". Le Page Renouf called it "a disease which springs up at a peculiar stage of human culture"; while those writers who, like Madame Blavatsky and Gerald Massey, championed a wider and wiser view, were dubbed cranks, unworthy of serious attention.

The authors of *Asiatic Mythology* make little or no attempt to interpret the myths they narrate in terms of the inner and outer history of man and nature. They are content to give such an account of the subject as to supply an explanatory commentary on the illustrations, which cover, with more or less completeness, the whole field of Eastern religious art. These illustrations have been chosen with discrimination and admirably reproduced, some of the plates in particular affording striking demonstration of the perfection that has been reached by the modern art of printing in colour. Among the more important subjects depicted are scenes from the life of the Buddha, photographed from the sculptures of Amarāvatī, Sānchī, Borobudur, and Angkor Vat; Brahmin sculptures; Chinese and Japanese prints and bronzes; and last, but not least, an extremely interesting series of Tibetan paintings. These are copied on a much reduced scale and are not coloured; but even thus some of them are so beautiful as to suggest that the originals must be indeed masterpieces both in design and execution.

R. A. V. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

"THEOSOPHY AND SCIENCE"

Cecil Williams, in his comment on my article in THE ARYAN PATH of March 1932, raises objections which indicate that he did not quite get the points I was attempting to make. For this I am willing to accept part of the responsibility in not having made myself sufficiently clear. Part of the fault, however, seems to lie in careless reading of the article. "The philosophy of Kant" he says, "misses the Theosophical viewpoint". Of course it does. On p. 196 I stated that Kant's work threw light on Theosophy only "from the ordinary material standpoint".

Mr. Williams has similarly misinterpreted my remarks on space. He refers to H. P. B.'s statement in *The Secret Doctrine* (commentary of Stanza 1, p. 35) but at the end of this paragraph, H. P. B. refers the reader to the "Proem pp. *2 et seq*" where she says (p. 21)—referring to that first stanza—"such a state can only be symbolised," and on p.14 she says, "'Beness' is symbolised in the Secret Doctrine under two aspects. On the one hand, absolute abstract Space, representing bare subjectivity, etc."

Again, in his reference to the Mahatma letter Mr. Williams goes wide of the point. In the first place he misquotes me as saying "time is merely the form of our external perception". I said *internal*, not external. This is minor, but he then quotes *Mahatma Letters* (p. 193) as contradicting me in saying "the whole Cosmos is a gigantic chronometer". So it is, of course; and if he had quoted the remaining few words any possible misunderstanding would have been avoided. What the Mahatma actually said was: "the whole Cosmos is a gigantic chronometer *in one sense*". (Italics mine).

I believe that if Mr. Williams would read my article a little more carefully he would see that I was not trying to "square Theosophy with ephemeral scientific and philosophic theory," but merely attempting to point out to those more familiar with materialistic science than with Theosophy, that even science and philosophy—carried far enough—will lead one to indications of Theosophy.

New Jersey PHILIP CHAPIN JONES

[In an early issue of THE ARYAN PATH we will publish another article of Mr. Jones, one "which will clarify any remaining confusion in the mind of Mr. Williams".—EDS.]

VEGETARIANISM

Having read with great interest H. Reinheimer's convincing reasons for vegetarianism, may I add a very personal account of my own conversion? From an early age I had loved all animals. Unkindness to these creatures was an act of irreverence to the Deity.

But I was still very young, and possessed a touching faith in the wisdom and goodness of all my elders. It had not occurred to me to question the rightness of the food provided for me at the family table. Suddenly the scales fell from my eyes, and I realised with shame and horror that I was feeding my body with the cruelly slaughtered bodies of beloved animal brethren. And, on further enquiry, I ascertained that no dire necessity compelled the human race to this inhuman practice. It seemed inexplicable that my fellow men, who claimed so much superiority in mental and moral calibre over what they described as "the brutes that perish," should be content in such a matter to place themselves on a level with the carnivorous beasts whom they constantly condemned as rapacious and cruel. How, I questioned, had it come about that men reverenced their own bodies so little as to be content to make them into walking sepulchres, unclean and foul; to build the very temples of the Living God with wanton destruction and death? Small wonder that disease in every imaginable form is rampant. The city streets

are rendered unsightly and horrible by the display of flayed carcases hung row on row outside the butchers' shops. I turned my gaze in many directions, and from all quarters fresh evidence proved the appalling nature and far-reaching consequences of our unnatural crime against our lesser brethren. Never more would I, now made conscious of responsibility, have part or lot in the slaughter of the innocents. I know that to all my brothers Light is destined to come. However dormant it may seem, Love *is* ever present in every unit and, sooner or later, will make Itself manifest by bestowing on all such realization of the sacredness and Oneness of life as will restore the harmony that should, and in Reality, doth even now prevail, between all the manifold ideas in the Divine Mind.

Malvern, England. TOM LEON

THE DRAMA OF LIFE
(*A Rejoinder*)

Allow me space to comment upon a remark by Mr. Fausset in a review of my book *Towards a Systematic Study of Vedanta* in the July ARYAN PATH. The reviewer has the rare gift of intellectual sympathy and imaginative insight and I am grateful for his criticism and appreciation.

There is, however, one point which requires elucidation. Mr. Fausset has realized the true import of the doctrine of *Līlā* as expounded by Śaṃkara with reference to the problem of Creation:

> Dr. Das comments very helpfully upon Śaṃkara's use of the word 'play' to explain the principle of creation. But he neglects to cite the example of art.

I do plead guilty but wish to submit an explanation. The reviewer observes:

> The supreme moments of artistic creation afford, perhaps, the closest human analogy to what Śaṃkara meant by the Divine 'Play' .... And the unique significance of Śaṃkara's conception of creation lay in the fact that he viewed Isvara as a supreme artist, constrained in his cosmic play by no such purpose or end as the self-conscious human mind pursues.

I am in hearty agreement with this but I could not, out of a scrupulous regard for authenticity of my exegesis of the Śaṃkarite point of view, make use of an example to which the great *Achārya* does not appear to have lent countenance. What appeals to him instead is the comparison of the Divine Creator to a sovereign playing at dice (*Sārvabhaumasya dyutakridādivat*). This analogy is peculiarly apt and felicitous in the context in which it appears—namely, the fact of creation not being conditioned by an operative end (*Na prayojanavatvāt*). Says Śaṃkara:

> Even if into all human rendering of *Līlā* one may project or read a subtle or refined purpose, yet into Divine creativity no such reading of purpose, in ever so attenuated a form, is feasible.

Leaving aside the letter of Śaṃkara's exposition, one may claim a certain amount of latitude and draw upon the example of art, which would not in any way offend against the spirit of Śaṃkara's exegesis. This has been done—as evidence I may refer to the very opening paragraph of my discussion of this very problem where I have unreservedly spoken of 'the artistic appeal and suggestiveness' [of *Līlā*] (p. 195).

But the example of art does not, and indeed cannot satisfy the requirements of a philosophical explanation of creation. Creation conceived as a *Līlā* or sport is a pseudo-logical explanation, or rather an evasion of it. In the very first paragraph of the Lecture dealing with this problem I have observed that *līlā*, like *māyā*, "is a *description*, not an *explanation*. For what does it amount to after all? It amounts to saying in so many words that God creates the world because it is his nature to create". The verdict that is thus registered in advance has been progressively justified. What I have sought to demonstrate is the failure of Art in encompassing the secret of creation in a religious reference. It is instructive to note that the position to which I have been led, by following strictly the lead of Śaṃkara's arguments, is somewhat similar to the procedure of Hegel in this regard. The Spirit, by virtue of its inner dialectic, passes beyond the region of Art as well as of Religion until it awakens to a self-conscious articulation of its own nature in Philosophy. Pursuing the drift of his own logic of absolutism, Śaṃkara has, in a like manner, demonstrated the failure of the aesthetic or the theistic category in its effort to grasp the true import of creation—which consists, as I have endeavoured to show, in tracing it up to Brahman "conceived as *Ānanda* that necessarily goes out of itself into an Other and reveals or fulfils itself therein, for it is the very nature of *Ānanda* to reveal itself (*ānanda-prakāśyorabhedāt*), as one of Śaṃkara's disciples commented in this regard" (p. 216). As I have further contended "it is in this concept of *ānanda* as the supreme principle and essence of *Atman* that all consequent developments of the Vedantic theory are anticipated and summed up" (p. 217); for "it is only *ānanda* which is essentially self-communicative and self-revealing. Creation proceeds out of the abundance of the Joy. But the end of creation cannot be an abstract or universal bliss anterior to concrete and specific forms of blessedness and joy. Every form of bliss or *ānanda* is *ipso facto* concrete and individual" (p. 221). Accordingly "all created beings are the living embodiments of the blessedness or *ānanda* of the Creator, affirms Śaṃkara" on the authority of the scriptural text—*tasyaivānandasya ekaikamātrāmupajīvanti* (p. 222); and finally this very text already "far-reaching in significance when read in the context of the scriptural text, no less illuminating on the point—that the Supreme Being or God is verily *Ānanda* or *Rasa* and having evoked or elicited *rasa* He realizes *ānanda* or enjoys His own being (*Raso vai sah Rasam hyevāyam labdhvānandī bhavāti*)" (p.225)—gives us the pivotal principle of Creation as well as the very quintessence of a Philosophy of Art. But this is a theme too large to be expounded here.

Calcutta SAROJ KUMAR DAS

ALLOPATHIC AND AYURVEDIC SYSTEMS

May I draw the attention of your readers to Dr. Samey's letter in the *Bangalore Mail* of 21st September, answering an attack on Ayurvedic system by Sir T. H. Symons in *The Indian Empire Review*. In that connection may I say that it is lamentable that the Allopathic Doctors in India should have chosen to be ignorant of the ancient system and yet revile it.

It must be freely allowed that the knowledge of the medical profession is small as compared to the magnitude of its ignorance, and yet *ex-cathedra* declarations of some of them against the Ayurvedic System show a dangerous penchant toward scientific dogma. Towards the end of his life the famous Dr. Mackenzi wrote:—

> For any doctor who engages conscientiously in general practice to look at a modern book on general medicine is for him to feel despair. At present the classification of disease is based upon no principle and is no more than an assemblage of conditions grouped according to the organ affected or the nature of the infection or the most predominant symptom.

But the Ayurvedic system of medicine has the best possible scientific foundation for it in its "Tridosha" theory, which some competent authority ought to write upon in your pages.

Bombay M. D.

REINCARNATION

As THE ARYAN PATH is interested in promulgating the doctrine of Reincarnation may I bring to the notice of your readers the Object of Mr. A. A. W. Mason's new novel *The Three Gentlemen.*

> To express my belief that we have lived before and carry into each new character what we have learned in the earlier lives. Thus discipline and passion for his country which Attilius Scourus learned in Roman Britain are the chief qualities of Anthony Scan the Elizabethan and Adrian Shard the Modern. To reproduce in the three lives something of a nation's as well as individual's continuity. To point to certain resemblances between the Roman Era when it had begun to go down hill and our own, a danger-signal no more. To write a story of love really triumphant.

Bombay REINCARNATIONIST

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"————————*ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."

HUDIBRAS.

The Presidential Address of Sir Alfred Ewing at the one hundred and first session of the British Association for the Advancement of Science is symptomatic and brings hope for the future. The commencement of a new cycle in racial evolution coincided with the dawn of the 20th century; its influences shook old grooves of thought, acquired habits, and inherited beliefs out of their stolidity. Science itself played an important part in ushering that era: Sir Alfred reminded his hearers of the "sensational, puzzling, upsetting" discoveries of the X-Rays by Röntgen in 1895, of radio-activity by Bacquerel in 1896, and of the electron by J. J. Thomson in 1897. Sir Alfred's retrospection in 1932 brings to mind H. P. Blavatsky's prophecy in 1888. In her *The Secret Doctrine* I, p. 612 she wrote:—

> We are at the very close of the cycle of 5,000 years of the present Aryan Kaliyuga; and between this time and 1897 there will be a large rent made in the Veil of Nature, and materialistic science will receive a death-blow.

The effects of Scientific Materialism on the thought of the people at large persists even to-day in spite of that death-blow. Men of science themselves were not able to see the far-reaching effects of materialism, on the moral outlook of the people. When men of science were witnessing matter fast becoming *maya*, their votaries lived and laboured as if matter was still solid and real. The energy of the new cycle produced the war of 1914–18 which disorganized further the mass mind; ever since it has laboured staggeringly; it must however soon find some level of stability and sanity. There is no other body of reformers so well-placed as the fraternity of scientists to guide and direct the race-mind to an ordered thinking. We regard some recent scientific pronouncements hopeful because they acknowledge that materialism is dead, that new vision of life and labour is necessary, and above all that scientific knowledge is a dangerous and deadly weapon in the hands of people with weak moral outlook.

Sir Alfred Ewing in his Presidential Address remarked at the outset that "our hundred years of Science have done sadly little towards curing the nations of mutual mistrust". Now science has not only given up its "cocksureness," but frankly admits that it is "groping in a half-light, tentatively grasping what at best are only half-truths". More—

> In the present-day thinkers' attitude towards what is called mechanical progress we are conscious of a changed spirit. Admiration is tempered by criticism; complacency has given way to doubt: doubt is passing into alarm. There is a sense of perplexity and frustration, as in one who has gone a long way and finds he has taken the wrong turning. To go back is impossible: how shall he proceed? Where will he find himself if he follows this path or that? An old exponent of applied mechanics may be forgiven if he expresses something of the disillusion with which, now standing aside, he watches the sweeping pageant of discovery and invention in which he used to take unbounded delight. It is impossible not to ask, Whither does this tremendous procession tend? What, after all, is its goal? What its probable influence upon the future of the human race?

Rightly proud of the grand achievements of his own caste of Engineers Sir Alfred said—

> The cornucopia of the engineer has been shaken over all the earth, scattering everywhere an endowment of previously unpossessed and unimagined capacities and powers. Beyond question many of these gifts are benefits to man, making life fuller, wider, healthier, richer in comforts and interests and in such happiness as material things can promote. But we are acutely aware that the engineer's gifts have been and may be grievously abused. In some there is potential tragedy as well as present burden. Man was ethically unprepared for so great a bounty. In the slow evolution of morals he is still unfit for the tremendous responsibility it entails. The command of Nature has been put into his hands before he knows how to command himself.

Sir Alfred Ewing at the end of his Address raised the question which has already been discussed by more than one eminent thinker in our pages—"How is man to spend the leisure he has won by handing over nearly all his burden to an untiring mechanical slave? Dare we hope for spiritual betterment as will qualify him to use it well?" Hope Sir Alfred may, and man has always hoped, but on the Door of the Temple of Wisdom are engraved the words—"Abandon Hope All Ye Who Enter Here." All will agree with Sir Alfred that "it is only by seeking he will find" but what will he seek and how? A grave difficulty stands in the way of science giving the right help in this search. It will persist as long as the vogue of commercializing scientific discoveries persists. The disparity between the possibilities offered by scientific inventions, and the actual use they are put to is amazing. Contrast the possibilities for spiritual betterment locked up in the Cinema, the Radio, the Gramophone, with the daily use they are put to and all will readily agree with Mr. Joad who wrote in our pages (January 1930) that "science has given us powers fit for the gods and we bring to their use the mentality of schoolboys. . . . . In our scientific knowledge, we are gods; in our ethics and politics, quarrelsome babies. And the babies are entrusted with the powers appropriate to the gods." Commerce exploits scientific knowledge and men of science alone can put a stop to it, and thus remove one great obstacle to social betterment.

> Science is utterly incompetent to explain the existence of the World as we know it now. Existence itself is a problem beyond its scope.

These are words of Sir Oliver Lodge who delivered the Oration during the 36th Foundation Week of the Union Society of the London University College, taking as his subject "Changes in Scientific outlook". The changes, he also pointed out "concern the revolt from the extreme materialism of the 19th century to more idealistic views". This change is not due to

> the work of idealistic philosophers and theologians, but of men who have immersed themselves in the facts of nature, who have penetrated deeply into physical laws, and have found in them support for idealistic views such as have been adumbrated and indistinctly foreshadowed since the time of Plato.

Sir Oliver Lodge himself has been a rebel for many years and has made no small contribution in ushering the idealistic view of life and universe. He said:

> Now it so happens that I and a few other men of science have been led by experiment and by a strictly rational method of procedure to discover a spiritual world or mode of existence, interacting with our bodily frame and all that we directly apprehend, and to speculations or surmises that it is a dominating reality to which appeals must be made if the design and purpose, and even the origin, of the material world is ever to be understood. Any system of philosophy, to be effective, must take the whole of existence into account; and the whole of existence cannot be taken into account if a portion of it is eschewed and anathematised and protected from contemplation. Now it so happens that orthodox Science and orthodox Theology have combined to oppose researches or enquiry into a number of phenomena which they genuinely think lie outside the pale, as unworthy of reasoned attention; the impression being that they constitute a source of danger, tending to lead us back into the darkness and confusions of primitive animistic superstitions. I fully admit that there is a real danger in that direction, but it is one which in the interests of truth we ought to face.

Space forbids our quoting more of these idealistic views of a spiritual universe, several of which are Theosophical. Not only orthodox science and theology oppose them but also

> a certain Group to-day who have arrogated to themselves the honourable titles of Rationalist and Free Thinker, who aim at a kind of inverted orthodoxy in a negative direction, who pride themselves on a disbelief in every kind of Theology, and who carry on a sort of war against those who are led by their rationalistic studies in Astronomy and other subjects to speculate on great themes.

We fully agree with Sir Oliver—"They have, it seems to me, overshot their mark, and become rather irrational and prejudiced on the other side."

Sir Alfred Ewing spoke as a pure scientist rich with the experience of a long career—the oldest President the Association has ever had; Sir Oliver Lodge as a renowned physicist who finds "that the spiritual world is the great reality: all else, however beautiful and interesting, is temporary and evanescent"; and now we must turn to a third knight, who as a thinker does not disdain to press science in the service of fair philosophy. Sir Herbert Samuel's Presidential Address to the British Institute of Philsophy was on the subject of "Philosophy and the Ordinary Man". Defining Philosophy as the science of ideas he described the threefold sphere of philosophy to be the universe, mind and human conduct.

> The world in these days is full of intellectual discontent. A chaos of thought is the mark of our time. The impact of modern science on the old theologies has bewildered mankind. The new proximity of races formerly far apart has increased the confusion. The soul of man is troubled and is seeking tranquillity. So there is an urgent need for an authoritative code of morals, based on an accepted system of ethics, resting in turn upon as firm a metaphysical foundation as human intelligence can construct from the materials that are given. There lies the task before philosophy; there the service she can render; there the way to win the gratitude of the peoples, wandering now hungry, thirsty, anxious, along paths that seem no longer clearly traced towards a destination no longer clearly seen. But does philosophy perceive that high task, or, perceiving, does she ensue it?

Sir Herbert Samuel complained that while Science had triumphantly marched on during the last three centuries "her sister Philosophy is seen sitting, somewhat ruefully, not very far from where she was three hundred years ago". Philosophy needs a "Bacon" and a "*Novum Organum*" to persuade her to take a new path.

> Philosophy would be well advised to turn aside from *a priori* methods, to put no great faith in Logic as a guide, to observe respectfully, but from a distance the Categorical Imperative and the Absolute Good and all their transcendental offspring, and to press forward into the realms of metaphysics, and ethics along the roads opened up by mathematics, physics, biology in general and psychology in particular, and by the Social Sciences. Although the provinces of philosophy and science are different, they adjoin, and there are no frontier barriers; the traveller in each may pass freely into the other, and often indeed he will not know in which territory he may be standing.

It would be wise for the modern philosopher to weaken his faith in Logic, to put distance between himself and his favourite abstractions, and above all to establish contact with human problems marked by human heart-beats; but to depend on the findings of science, especially "up-to-date" psychology, will prove worse than abortive. The modern philosopher must avoid such a *cul-de-sac*. Let him not look for a new Bacon but turn to Plato of old. Let him by all means use science but guard against his own goddess being exploited by science or theology.

Sir Herbert followed up by stating that "the first principle which philosophy might receive as established by science, was the Law of Causality . . . The whole work of science has been built upon the recognition of this principle. Applied in fresh ways in the sphere of philosophy it might give valuable results". We agree and are quite prepared to render unto the Cæsars of modern science whatever credit might belong to them, but we must plead that homage be rendered to the ancient Gods whose visions and contemplations established Causality as a Law even when Greece

was young. Causality or Karma as a physical and moral, mental and spiritual Law has been the basis of thought and discussion among Indian philosophers for millennia. Why should modern philosophy, in search of a new mode of expression, be guided by ever changing young science, and neglect its own ancient line of inheritance ?

However, Sir Herbert Samuel examines this problem in his own way and in his treatment comes near to Theosophical propositions in more than one instance. His exposition of the doctrine of free will and determinism is masterly in parts, and would have been flawless and complete had he pressed into his service the Law of Reincarnation. "The prior causes, through the human personality, transmit their effects in a new form into the future. Looking back we see determinism, looking forward we see free will"—that is true; but no penetrating mind can accept this without the doctrine of many lives on earth. Truly have Karma and Reincarnation been called twin-doctrines.

We take the following from the October number of *The Theosophical Movement* (Bombay):—

True Theosophists will salute with gratitude Gandhiji, the high-souled leader whose philanthropic penance has been directly instrumental in removing to a considerable extent the age long curse of untouchability which orthodox Hinduism laid on nearly one-sixth of India's children, who by race, etc., belong to that religion. It is not only a relief that a precious life has been saved, it is also an inspiration that Piety and Will have won a grand victory over the forces of creedal and religious dogmatism. It is such self-sacrifice and determination which shape the future Bodhisattvas. We desire to express our deep appreciation to Gandhiji for the impetus he has given to the sacred Cause of Universal Brotherhood, and for one more example of working out of an inner conviction to its glorious fruition. Many hold convictions which are noble and grand but only a rare few possess the Karmic stamina and courage to live upto them.

Our archæologists have encountered a fresh problem. Sir E. Denison Ross in a letter to *The Times* of 21st September says :

M. Guillaume Hevesy, a learned Hungarian resident in Paris, has now made a very remarkable discovery, which, though it does not throw any light on the interpretation of the Indus script, raises a new problem regarding its origin. About 60 years ago Father Eyraud, a French missionary, discovered in the Easter Island an unknown style of writing, which appears not only on tablets of hard wood, but also on weapons and on the collars worn by chiefs. Now the signs of this writing bear the most astonishing similarity to the signs which occur on the Indus Valley seals, while some occur in Proto-Elamic of Susa, but not in the Indus seals.

The astonishing similarity can be understood without difficulty if the following words of H. P. Blavatsky are pondered over :—

The Secret Doctrine is the common property of the countless millions of men born under various climates, in times with which History refuses to deal, and to which esoteric teachings assign dates incompatible with the theories of Geology and Anthropology. The birth and evolution of the Sacred Science of the Past are lost in the very night of Time. . . . . .

The fragments of the systems that have now reached us are rejected as absurd fables. Nevertheless, occult Science—having survived even the great Flood that submerged the antediluvian giants and with them their very memory, save in the Secret Doctrine, the Bible and other Scriptures—still holds the Key to all the world problems. Let us apply that Key to the rare fragments of long-forgotten cosmogonies and try by their scattered parts to re-establish the once Universal Cosmogony of the Secret Doctrine. The Key fits them all. (*Secret Doctrine*. II. 794; I. 341).

ॐ

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light ! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. III DECEMBER 1932 No. 12

OUR PATH

Our esteemed contributor Professor A. R. Wadia takes exception to certain remarks of ours about his able article "India and Objective Reality" in our October issue, and also to what we have said about it in introducing "The Thrill Psychosis" by Charles Dernier in our last issue. We gladly make room for Professor Wadia's letter (P. 853) and we would like to take the opportunity it affords and say something about this journal which completes its third volume with this number. In passing we will only comment —how can Prof. Wadia "entirely agree" with Mr. Dernier's article, and yet consider Mr. Chitnavis's description "a caricature" of western civilization? Mr. Dernier's description seems to us to support tangibly and substantially Mr. Chitnavis's. Prof. Wadia explains that he focused his attention on the good in Western Civilization as a set-off to Mr. Chitnavis's article. But then, Mr. Chitnavis had focused his on the good in eastern culture as a set-off to Mr. Mason's original article !

But to our purpose: It is the studied policy of this journal to leave its contributors full freedom of expression within the bounds of decorum and the law of the land. Convinced that the curse of false knowledge and its child superstition, envelops the major portion of the human race, from which it can be freed only by a steady and persistent effort of presenting the many aspects of every problem and question, THE ARYAN PATH purposely invites (and when they come unsolicited heartily welcomes) differing and different expressions of views. One of its aims is to show that Wisdom is Eternal and Universal :

It is neither ancient, nor modern; it is neither eastern nor western. Men and classes of men neglect Wisdom and follow knowledge learnt from their own caste or nation, from their own country or race, regardless of the knowledge of their neighbours. Pride of caste and class, race and religion befog the vision and make the Ideal of *Universal* Brotherhood utopian and unrealizable. We hold that by seeking Universal Wisdom men will be able to build the kingdom of Universal Brotherhood. There are Indians who believe that their country's salvation lies in abandoning the old and obtaining the new; such seek the West. There are others who think that salvation lies enshrined in the ancient Himalayas and try to seek a refuge in their snowy range. The Indian masses have sunk into mental lethargy for many centuries. We hold that neither by going to the Occident nor by repairing to the heights will salvation be gained. Similarly the West will not save herself by merely seeking the eastern horizon, saying —Ex Oriente Lux; anymore than by false perseverance in perfecting its own machine of civilization, which has proved a failure. Its masses have been suffering from corrupted morals and manners due to a wrong philosophy of life.

We are firm in our faith born of experience that man's salvation lies in retreating within, and from that citadel controlling and using afresh the creative sensorium. We are not labouring for the dead albeit glorious past, but, in the living present for the more glorious morrow. Our philosophy does not teach that Spirit is real and Matter unreal, or vice versa, but that both are real. The modern West is suffering from the forces let loose by science whose God is matter; modern India from those let loose by religion whose God is conservatism. That is what Mr. Judge, the great Theosophist of the last century meant when he said that the West is suffering from *Rajoguna* and India from *Tamas*. Activity in action leading to destruction that is the picture of the Occident; a slow lethargic murmur "let me alone to my Kismet" that of India. Both these are forces of decay and death. Life moves from within and can be made to control and conquer decay and death. There are men and women in the Occident who are engaged in this high enterprise, as there are in the Orient. Such are seekers of the Living Path, treaders of the Noble Path, which we, endeavouring to bring East and West together, name—THE ARYAN PATH.

THE JOURNALIST OF FUTURE INDIA

[**Ramananda Chatterjee,** the loved and respected Editor of *The Modern Review* writes from experience born of achievements. In India the journalist is still in the making and for the determined aspirant this article brings a message.

In self-governing India of the future, the press, let us hope, will be free and thus will be able to mould people's thoughts more than is possible for it at present.

This is the period of preparation and offers an opportunity not only to the future editor and the professional journalist but also to the free-lance writer, and this article provides food for reflection and ideas for practice.

Not only in "backward countries" like India has the journalist scope for improvement; a few months ago so able and conscientious a publicist as Sir Norman Angell said:—

How can I believe in the honesty of the Press when I have such a close example of, shall we say, its carelessness. Time and again I have offered to pay £ 500 to charity if anybody can show me one line in any of my pre-War books in which I state that war is impossible. Not a week goes by but I receive cuttings from every part of the globe coupling my name with this ridiculous assertion I never made . . . . . The Press has the means to wield enormous power for good. It should make important things interesting. Its greatest offence at present is to exploit the trivial by making it interesting.]

When Wendell Phillips, the American abolitionist, reformer and orator, declared, "Let me make the newspaper and I care not who makes the religion or the Laws," he was thinking of the ideal newspaper conducted by journalists with adequate moral and intellectual equipment. I shall try to say what this equipment should be with reference to Indian conditions.

The average Indian journalist who works for money may take to the profession with a high object. But his achievement can be commensurate only with his character, attainments, capacity and industry. Whatever his attainments, capacity and industry, he cannot be much of a public benefactor unless he possesses character. He should also be able to work very hard systematically and regularly. Among other things, total abstinence from intoxicating and narcotic liquors and drugs will help him to do so. A journalist need not be without genius; but however great a genius he may be, he must be prepared for a life of unremitting toil to begin with—call it drudgery, if you will. Readiness is another quality which he must have. He should have all his wits about him. A Journalist cannot succeed in his profession if his memory be not very retentive and capacious, for one cannot command a reference library everywhere and at all times. But accuracy must never be sacrificed. Moreover, there are things which cannot be found in any publication, which a man learns by using his eyes and ears; and though a journalist should always have a notebook with him, everything which one sees and hears cannot be jotted down at once, if at all.

Journalists should cultivate the

habits of considering a question from as many points of view as possible, of judicious impartiality and of calm and balanced judgment. Eloquent and impassioned writing may come after. It is a mistake to think that any one can be free from bias and prejudice without effort—without what we Hindus call *sādhanā*. It should, therefore, be a journalist's constant endeavour to remove from his mind bias, prejudice, partisanship, and self-interest. Though a hero may not court danger and death and though it is not a soldier's ideal to run unnecessary risks, it is only a truism to say that an ideal journalist should be quite fearless.

A journalist may be truly said to have taken all knowledge for his province. It would be difficult to say what kinds of knowledge would be perfectly useless to him. The omniscience of editors is a well-worn joke. But though it goes without saying that editors like other human beings cannot be omniscient, the more subjects and more things they know, the better fitted for their work would they be.

The chief subject of discourse and discussion in newspapers is politics. Hence politics in the abstract and as embodied in the history and laws of nations and their constitutions and governments, should be studied by journalists.

As we have to do with India, a study of Western politics alone, from the works of Aristotle and Machiavelli downwards, will not do for us. It is necessary for Indian journalists to study *Sukraniti*, the *Arthasastra* of Kautilya, the maxims of Kamandaka, the Shanti Parva of the *Mahabharata*, etc., and modern works on Hindu politics and administration in ancient India written by Indian scholars. An up-to-date journalist needs to be acquainted with even the latest thing in popular government, *viz.*, the principles underlying the Soviet government of Russia and its aims and achievements.

Circumstanced as India is, we cannot do without a sound knowledge of history, which is a sure cure for national despondency and a tonic for national debility. The history of those peoples in particular which, after arriving at a high stage of civilization and then falling into decay or remaining unprogressive, have again joined in the onward march of nations, is sure to fill us with new life and hope. The history of Japan, Turkey, Persia, Siam, etc., is well worth study. A somewhat detailed knowledge of the history of our own country is necessary, in order that we may know why and how we have become what we are and how we may be what we ought to be.

The last great war and its after-effects have convinced thinking men in all civilized lands that the fates of all peoples and nations are inextricably interwoven. This makes it necessary for all public men and newspaper men to be acquainted with contemporary world history and world politics. Indian newspapers and periodicals generally fight shy of the discussion of foreign politics, partly because of inadequate knowledge, but mainly because of pre-occupation with our own disabilities, grievances and misery. It would be better if we could feel more at home in international politics and had a working knowledge of international law. It is true, formally and officially India has no independent political relations with other countries. But informally and non-officially we can influence and be influenced by foreign nations. Moreover, even though the British Government may have decided that foreign affairs are to remain in the hands of the Governor-General of India, that decision is not unalterable like the law of the Medes and Persians. Foreign relations should and must come under popular control.

Economic freedom is not less necessary than political freedom. An adequate understanding of economic problems, including industrial ones, is necessary for national efficiency and prosperity. So our journalists must know economics. The interdependence of nations should be more evident even to the man in the street (if only he knew and would think of it) in the spheres of commerce, industry, finance, banking, business in general and economics than in the province of politics. Newspaper men have, therefore, to be in their element in economics and all that is related thereto and included therein.

II

Like houses, machinery and vehicles, social organisations or systems, too, are liable to decay and disruption. They can be mended or renovated to the advantage of the people concerned by those who are acquainted with human psychology, moral philosophy and the principles of sociology. Anthropology, the laws of heredity, and the science and art of race culture as related to sociology, should also engage our attention.

Progress and improvement are impossible for any people without education. The science and art of education, the relation of the state to education, the influence of Art, Literature, Science and Religion on national character, and how these in their turn are influenced by national character,—these are subjects well worth the serious attention of those who desire to serve their people faithfully. There is not the least doubt that children and, along with them, all mankind have suffered on account of the prevailing ignorance of child psychology. Our loss has not been smaller because of ignorance of what women are capable of and owing to preconceived notions relating to that sex, which woman's part in the present Indian national movement should, at any rate, eradicate. Newspaper men should have sufficient up-to-date knowledge to be able to do full justice to the woman's cause, which, as the poet says, is also man's.

News and comments on news

relating to crimes, arrests, trials, judgments, punishments, prisons, prison-reform, executions, etc., form not an inconsiderable part of the contents of newspapers. Hence journalists require to know the law, judicial procedure, jurisprudence, criminology and penology.

Editors have to discuss village and town improvement schemes, the respective advantages and disadvantage of rural and urban life, rural and urban sanitation, etc. Our equipment should, therefore, include a knowledge of the history and causes of outbreaks of epidemics, sanitation, town-planning, and the like.

Town and village industries, including agriculture, and various vocations and professions are necessary for the existence and progress of society. All kinds of productive activity are attended with some disadvantages or other. Publicists ought to be able to suggest and discuss remedies. This would require an adequate knowledge regarding these industries, vocations and professions. Mining laws, forest laws, etc., should be such as would tend to the conservation and promotion of the interests of the people of a country. To be able to safeguard such interests, we require to be acquainted with such laws, particularly with mining laws, in all progressive and democratically governed countries. A knowledge of geology and mineralogy also will not come amiss.

All questions and legislation relating to Labour in field, factory and plantation have to be studied by us. The publications of the International Labour office at Geneva and the works of such Indian authors as Dr. Rajanikanta Das have facilitated such study.

Vitally connected with agriculture and other industries are the problems of railway transportation and administration, shipping and navigation on the high seas, coastal navigation, inland waterways, motor traction along highways, aerial transport, radio, telegraph, telephone and postal rules and rates, customs duties, transit dues, octroi, terminal taxes, tariff, exchange, currency and the like. Great progress has been made in the handling of these problems in the West and in Japan. We should be acquainted with the state of things in all these matters in the most progressive countries. As forming the groundwork for such studies, a thorough knowledge and grasp of commercial geography would be of great use.

Speaking of geography, it would be of use to know definitely how many races, speaking how many languages and following how many religions, inhabit some of the biggest independent states in the world, like the United States of America and Soviet Russia. It would be also useful to know that "religious" riots and massacres have never been a monopoly of subject India, but occur and occurred in many independent countries of the world.

Such knowledge would help us to tell our people with conviction

that some of the arguments brought forward by opponents of self-rule in India are not irrefutable.

In politics and in industries, as well as in transportation, larger and larger masses of men are getting involved and interested day by day. Crowd psychology, implying a knowledge of the group mind should also, therefore, be studied by us.

The duty of journalists is to conserve all that is good in the existing state of things, to revive, if possible, all that was good in the old order, to reform abuses where they exist, in order that the good may survive, and to suggest and help in the introduction of what is new for the promotion of the common weal.

Progress in any sphere of life is dependent on progress in all other spheres. Hence a publicist who is a genuine and thoughtful progressivist in any sphere cannot but sympathise with and support progress in all other directions. But faith in the possibility of progress in any sphere and all spheres is itself born of conscious or unconscious faith in the certainty of human improvement. That, again, is founded on the conscious or unconscious conviction that there is moral government in this universe, that this universe is ruled by an Immanent and Transcendent Spirit whose Will makes for the welfare of man.

Hence, when Wendell Phillips delivered his oft-quoted dictum, he had in mind ideal newspapers conducted by persons who, in addition to being statesmen of high character, lofty aims, great capacity and ripe wisdom, are inspired with faith in the world's tendency towards perfectibility and guided by the light that lightens the world.

I have said above that it should be a journalist's constant endeavour to remove from his mind all bias, prejudice and partiality. Such endeavour is vitally important in India. It is the supreme good fortune of India that our country is inhabited by followers of all the great religions of the world; for truth is infinite and many-sided and cannot be grasped in its entirety by any single individual or group of individuals, and hence many earnest spirits are needed to see the many aspects of truth. But this great blessing of India has been turned into a curse by the fanaticism of narrow-minded bigots and by those who wish to exploit such fanaticism for their own selfish purposes. It should be the aim and duty of well-meaning journalists to counteract such fanaticism and its exploitation. They can do so only if they have respect for all religions. They can have such enlightened respect if they have taken pains to acquaint themselves with the truths contained in all scriptures and the laudable achievements of all religious communities. These should form part of the study of our journalists.

III

Though a few distinguished men of genius have sometimes

done journalistic work, ordinarily journalism does not require genius of a high order but only the qualities, talents and attainments I have already referred to. Of course, no journalist can know everything, no one can become a walking encyclopædia. Every one of us can, however, have a general knowledge of many of the essential subjects and a detailed knowledge of one or two subjects. But whatever our talents, attainments and achievement, it should not be taken for granted that a great or a successful journalist is to be counted among the immortals. We cannot too clearly grasp or too vividly and tenaciously bear this fact in mind. For, as it is our task sometimes to sit in judgment on even the greatest poets, philosophers, artists, scientists and statesmen, we are apt to become conceited, considering ourselves equal and sometimes superior to those whom we judge and criticize.

As the journalist is a popular educator, one of his special functions ought to be to make even abstruse and difficult things intelligible and interesting to the man in the street. His business is not merely with the ephemeral politics of the hour, but with all that makes life worth living. So all knowledge and beauty, all elevating influences, all that makes for joy and power, have to be brought to everybody's door in acceptable but *not* sensational forms.

It is a main part of our duty to report and record what happens. These happenings are of various kinds. Some are good, some bad; some sensational, some quite humdrum. Things which are bad are reported to a far greater extent than things which are good. Criminal news of various sorts and reports of the proceedings of many kinds of courts make more "interesting" copy than stories of the good that is being done all over the world in innumerable ways. But perhaps it is possible not only to record great good deeds but even to narrate little acts of kindness and courtesy in a charming and inspiring manner. I have drawn attention to this matter, because, examples of courtesy and kindness not being generally reported, whereas instances of rudeness and cruelty are more frequently reported in detail, an impression may prevail that in this world there is more of the latter than of the former, which is perhaps not true.

As between countries, peoples, nations and governments, all signs of strained relations, all sinister surmises and suspicions and scares are quickly published. But efforts to promote amity between peoples, and all those things which naturally go to draw peoples closer towards one another, do not receive prompt and prominent publication, and most often they are not at all published. The world-public may thus be led to believe that all peoples are only waiting for an opportunity to fly at one another's throats, which may not be a fact. *It has often seemed to me that we journalists do not do all that we can to promote friendship between the peoples of the earth.* Were we to devote more time and space, than we do, to the literatures, arts, humane and philanthropic activities and the like, of different countries, the peoples of the world might love and respect one another more than they do. This is a kind of work which journals belonging to powerful nations can do better than others. But they do not. If they really want to promote peace, they should do such work.

Our duty being to report what is happening in the world, we should record not only new scientific discoveries and inventions, but also take note of new ideas, thoughts, feelings and impulses, and forms of beauty, as they manifest themselves in the work of contemporary poets, philosophers and artists of different countries. No doubt, it is not so easy to discern the emergence of new thoughts, ideas, forms of beauty, feelings and impulses as to grasp and publish the other things which are our usual stock in trade. But the things which may be called objective or external happenings ought not to be allowed to monopolize all our attention, to the exclusion of what may be styled subjective happenings or events in man's inner world.

Movements and organizations which strike across the barriers of country, race, nation, creed and language have happily begun to claim our attention. A time there was when history was understood to mean a chronicle of the rise and fall of dynasties, of dynastic wars due to dynastic ambitions, fights between nations and their kings, etc. A sounder and more comprehensive view of the historian's work has prevailed for some time past. Modern books of history which approach the ideal are histories of peoples—of their culture and civilization, of the evolution of their societies, literature, art, commerce, industry, and the like, and their interaction. The historian also notes how there has been the spread of cultural influence of a people though there may not have been any political and economic conquest and domination by it of any other people. *In ancient times India influenced many countries which she never conquered.* And, though a subject country now, her philosophy, religion, literature and art continue to influence mankind.

The change in the conception of history indicated above ought to bring about a change in the conception of our duty as journalists. For newspapers and periodicals are fragments of the history of our own times. And, in my conception of the vocation of journalism, we ought to equip ourselves to become, not merely the recorders and critics of this contemporary history, but the makers of the history of the external and inner lives of men as well.

RAMANANDA CHATTERJEE

PASSIVE RESISTANCE

[**George Godwin** here gives the philosophy underlying his recent novel *Empty Victory*; the article was written before the additional proof of the efficacy of Soul-force was offered by Gandhiji through his "magical fast". There are two points about Passive Resistance which press for study and consideration: One, while admitting that the disciplined individuals like Gandhiji are bound to succeed through their sacrificial exercise, what about individuals who are not sufficiently pure in their character and outlook, nor sufficiently lofty and altruistic in their ideas and actions? Can any one on any occasion, to be determined by himself as fit and proper, offer passive resistance and succeed—in *any* sense? Does not his moral-weakness, of a life time perhaps, stand in the way of a man when he undertakes to offer passive resistance? Therefore the preparatory work of the would-be passive resister is an immensely important factor. Too many try to show off where many Gods themselves prefer to remain invisible. That raises the second point: Can a group of men, a class or a community not to mention big nations to which the article refers, offer passive resistance? If non-pure (not to speak of impure) persons are in that group is not the result likely to be more injurious to the very cause for which passive resistance is offered? If Soul-Force is a stupendous fact its opposite passion-force is another. *Satyagraha*, Soul-Force, Passive Resistance, whatever the name—is it such an easy weapon either for individuals, or nations to handle?—EDS.]

When we use the term "force" we commonly mean by it violence, intense effort, or coercion. It suggests all the awe-inspiring paraphernalia of a great modern army; the political machinery directed against political minorities; armed strife in the industrial field, and, thus seen, it appears to us an element in modern life inimical to the happiness of mankind.

Throughout the centuries mankind has been content to meet this evil with its like: the answer to force was force. So the world has witnessed the horrors of recurrent wars, the persecution of political minorities and sometimes their extirpation, and, in the sphere of industry, the methods of the battle-field: gas, machine guns, bombs.

Here and there a voice has been raised to suggest that no moral issue can be determined by force, which can do no more than decide between belligerents the issue of relative strength. Here and there, too, voices have been raised against the persecution of political minorities and the enslavement of the working classes.

Tolstoi embarrassed the western churches by his assumption that Christianity was a religion applicable to the daily life of the world with a heaven-sent solution of man's manifold troubles in its central doctrine of love and forgiveness. He preached passive resistance to war along with the inherent right of all men to liberty of conscience; he preached submission to social and political wrong, a passive resistance, untainted by hatred or animosity.

Kropotkin, following a like line of reasoning, championed the

politically oppressed, preaching the gospel of political toleration. And other names will come readily enough into the reader's mind.

But these voices have been merely voices crying in the wilderness of a world obsessed with the fixed idea of force as remedy, and only within the last few years has any apostle of passive resistance contrived to challenge successfully the overwhelming machinery of political power.

The spectacle is a sublime one, and must inevitably make all thoughtful men pause to consider its implications.

How does it come about that a single man, Mahatma Gandhi, without a single rifle or machine gun, without a lone battalion at his call, can challenge and meet all the armed forces of the British Raj?

Wherein lies the secret of his amazing power, his successful resistance?

The merits and demerits of the two political and national aims in conflict does not concern us here. What is of supreme interest is the operation of what is termed non-force to force and the astonishing results which have flowed from it.

The explanation may be more simple than appears, however. It will depend upon our understanding of the term *force*.

Now, when we speak of force we commonly mean by that term violence, intense effort, coercion. That definition covers the phenomena of war, political and industrial oppression and the regulation of communities by police.

But force is not limited to the physical plane: it is transferable to the moral sphere. There it may be defined as moral strength, power to convince, and capacity to influence.

Now, a canon of conduct may appear less impressive than a cannon that fires projectiles. The question is, however, the relative force of the two. While it is quite self-evident that moral precepts cannot prevail against artillery, it is equally certain that the high explosive that can demolish a human aspiration has yet to be invented.

An issue thus joined cannot be resolved by physical force because the subject of it is not on the physical plane. Ideas and ideals can be opposed only by ideas and ideals of a higher spiritual category. You cannot demolish an ideal with artillery; you cannot quench the visions of the prophet in the cell of the prison house.

That, it is certain, is the lesson of history. The men die: but their ideals live after them, grow, and, indeed, flourish upon persecution.

Is, then, the answer to physical force in the realm of international, national, social and economic affairs, force of another quality?

There are indications, apparent in the world to-day, that this is so. The doctrine of passive resistance has gained many disciples of recent years. For a time, when the World War blinded the minds of men and darkened their hearts, the term carried a degree

of undeserved obloquy. The "conscientious objector" was scorned as a coward, whereas, of course, the courage he displayed, his resistance to the mass hysteria of war, his lonely, serene and untouchable soul, revealed him as the wielder of force of a peculiar and admirable sort.

The revenge of time has been complete. It is necessary to turn to the files of the Press during those years to conjure up once more the intensity of the feeling against all who proclaimed their faith that all war is nothing but murder and thus indefensible.

And to-day? Among the most scorned of all we find the names of present Prime Minister of England and that of a philosopher, Bertrand Russell, who gains in international reputation as time goes on.

Is the application of this higher force the ultimate solution of the disharmonies that deface the occasions of the modern world and reduce it to its present panic-stricken condition of mutual hates, fears and aggressions?

Is that nation which faces the danger of a new policy of disarmament, relying upon the power of passive force exerted upon the physical plane, going to indicate the real path to world peace?

Maybe we can get at some understanding of the principles involved by taking a very simple illustration. We will imagine two men, the one furiously enraged, the other completely calm and passive.

Now the enraged individual, past self-control, lusts after violence and pursues it. He strikes at his opponent, thirsting for the reaction to violence that will feed his own passion.

And what happens? His blows fall upon an unresisting body. It is a trite saying that it takes two to make a quarrel and it is as certain that it takes two to make a fight in the physical sense of that word. However frenzied by passion a man may be, he cannot continue for long to batter an unresisting rival. He will suffer an inevitable reaction and be promptly halted in his mad rush.

What is true of individuals must be true of nations. How can one conceive of a modern nation, completely disarmed, being permitted, by all those imponderables that go in their totality to make up world opinion, to perish?

A conqueror may impose his will upon the conquered in so far as the machinery of social and political life goes, but no further. History, in fact, provides us with more than one example of the victor as vanquished, for it has happened that the culture of a vanquished nation has replaced that of the vanquisher.

It is, in the view of many men to-day, an undoubted fact that no modern nation, completely disarmed, could be subjected to the degradation of servitude to an armed aggressor. Those who speak so glibly of the power of arms, who talk of God as upon the side of the strongest battalions,

overlook the factor of *quality*. The strongest is the highest. And so we see by looking closely that *force* is truly the answer of force, but not a like force, rather the force of a higher plane, the moral plane.

That, without doubt, is the explanation of the vast power wielded by such solitary spirits as those of Mahatma Gandhi. How are battalions and batteries to fight an enemy whose artillery is the spoken word? How is an ideal, whether you subscribe to it or not, to be quenched by imprisonment or death?

Those who would turn from the consideration of this avenue of escape from the cruelty and stupidity of the modern world, should ponder a while the implications of current events. The world, obsessed by fear, moves with awful precision towards the hour when destruction will demolish all that the centuries have built up.

Can we circumvent our destiny by pacts entered into in the spirit of the crafty huckster? Can we procure peace by preparing to use the resources of modern science for the wholesale destruction of life? Can we move towards world peace, industrial peace, political peace, by thinking in the barbaric terms of ultimate force as the remedy and the instrument for the imposition of will?

Man is a fighting animal, answer the wiseacres for whom always at any given period of history what is, is right.

And they speak truth. Man *is* a fighting animal. But he fights best when that for which he fights involves his spiritual nature: he fights best and battles most when, to blind force, he offers the impregnable bulwark of an unshakable faith and inflexibility of purpose.

That is what men call to-day passive resistance. Once a term of contempt, it gains ground, for by the test of efficiency it is revealed as the true and only answer to physical force. Time may reveal it as the instrument whereby mankind will redeem itself from the evils that press so hardly upon it to-day.

Armed force, aggression, coercion have failed, always must fail, since they are addressed not to the spiritual reality, but to the physical mirage.

The world seeks blindly for an alternative. It may be found when the strength of force exercised on the moral plane is clearly recognised. And those who deride this proposition as the dream of a visionary are invited to contemplate the inevitable consequences of adherence to the old manner—of the logical end of physical force in a world suffering from a soul-lag and armed with all the forces of Hell.

GEORGE GODWIN

DEVOTION IN ADVAITISM

[**Jagadiswarananda** is a swami of the Ramakrishna Mission Order at present in charge of the Colombo Branch.

Confusion and misunderstanding prevail on the subject of the Path of Devotion, which is regarded as something distinct and separate from the way of intellectual enquiry and attainment of knowledge.

In India many claim to walk this Path of Bhakti, but only few really tread it. Below we present a viewpoint of Advaita Vedanta.—EDS.]

There is a popular belief as well as a traditional charge against the school of Shankara that it ignores Bhakti or devotion as an aspect of spiritual culture, and thus it makes the hearts of its followers arid as the desert. The allegation is baseless. On the contrary it unites sublime knowledge to the deep feeling of devotion. Bhakti wedded to *gnana* or knowledge makes the religious life truly grand; for Bhakti saves *gnana* from its excess of dry-as-dust intellectualism; whereas Bhakti divorced from *gnana* degenerates into sentimentalism and even fanaticism.

Shankara himself, and a large number of his successors right upto the modern times, were not only profound metaphysicians but also devotees, and of the highest type. A proper understanding of Advaita throws great light on the real significance and inner meaning of true Bhakti, so different from, and superior to the mushy, sentimental emotionalism that too often passes as such.

The term Vedanta has been erroneously applied to Advaita alone. The *capstone* has been taken for granted as the whole Arch. But Vedanta includes all the three schools of Hinduism: the dualism (*dvaita*) of Madhva, the modified non-dualism (*vishishtādvaita*) of Rāmānuja as well as the non-dualism (*advaita*) of Shankara. Vedanta has been very unjustly made the target of attack, by Shaivas, Vaishnavas and other votaries of the Bhakti school. The Vedantists do not actually reject the dual plane (*dvaita*) of name and form (*nama* and *rupa*) where Bhakti like the polestar, guides the *bhaktas* to their object of adoration. Shankara, the lion of Vedanta wonderfully harmonised in his own life both Bhakti and *gnana* as is evident from many of his beautiful Sanskrit poems as *Gangastotra*, *Dakshinamurtistotra*, *Durgakshamaparadhanastotra*, *Annapurnastotra*, *Gurvashtaka*, etc. They are masterpieces of devotional verse full of sweetness and fervour.

Shri Ramakrishna, the modern prophet of Vedanta was an Advaitist of a rare calibre, yet he was filled with devotion for his *Ishta-Devi*—the Goddess *Kali*. He taught that pure devotion (*shuddha Bhakti*) and pure wisdom (*shuddha gnana*) are obverse and reverse of the same coin. They converge and meet at the same

point. Though the so-called differential barrier is not imaginary, yet it is not a permanent one.

The Vedanta consistently puts forward the view that Advaita is not only the goal of evolution as taught by the other schools of Vedanta, but also of all spiritual unfoldment; the mystics of all religions and one testify, in different ages and climes, the truth of Advaita. Advaita however, as a discipline and practice, is an expressly difficult method. It presupposes a cultural and spiritual evolution of a rare order, and only a few become fit for a direct initiation into its supreme and ultimate mystery. Advaita being the shortest and straightest path to self-realization the positive requisite for its aspirant is *tivra vairagya* or sharp dispassion for and detachment from the relative as illusory, and a consequent burning thirst for the Absolute or Reality.

The Ramayana describes the psychological interrelation between knowledge and devotion. Hanumana, the great devotee of Shri Rama, says to Rama: "By *deha-buddhi* I am your servant, by *Jiva-buddhi* I am a part of you, but by *Atma-buddhi* you and I are one." Here body (*deha*), soul (*jiva*), and Spirit (*Atman*) indicate respectively, the three conscious planes of body, mind, and Spirit. When the Gopis were consumed by the pang of separation (*viraha*) from Krishna they visualised Him everywhere around them, in all Nature, in plants, in animals, and even in stones. Yet some of them, specially Radha, realized in the height of her love that she was Krishna herself. This shows the metaphysical implication of Bhakti in Advaita, namely Identity.

Devotion or spiritual love has two aspects: *Bhakti* and *Prema*. Rare souls like Shri Chaitanya attain *Prema*, when, in the words of Ramakrishna, complete forgetfulness of the body and the external world is constant as in dream. It reaches its final consummation in sweet love, which is symbolically represented by the *yugalmilan* (union of the lover and the beloved) of Radha and Krishna. Here Bhakti is not a spiritual aid but an end in itself, or the highest value *Paramapurushartha*. It is the spiritual link between the lover and the beloved. This *prema* of *bhaktas* and the *Brahmananda* of the Vedantists realised in *Nirvikalpa Samadhi* constitutes the same experience.

The Vedantic definition of the highest form of Bhakti designated by Shankara in *Vivekachudamani shloka* 31, is the search after one's real spiritual nature. There he says emphatically that among other things conducive to liberation devotion holds the supreme place. All the five classifications of Bhakti according to *Shrimad Bhagavat*: peace (*shantā*), service (*dasya*), tenderness (*vatsalya*), friendship (*sakhya*) and sweetness (*madhurya*) are but different transformations of the same joy (*Ananda*) in different relations of soul to Spirit, *Atman* to *Paramat-*

man. Narada in his *Bhakti-sutras* defines devotion as extreme love to the One Being. Shandilya, another authority on the subject, describes it as extreme attachment to *Ishwara*, the Lord. On reflection it will appear that there is no great psychological difference between the two schools. For Bhakti is also a search after ultimate Reality that begins, continues and ends in love. As Tolstoy says love of God is love turned unto itself—love of love. So the difference between *Gnana* and *Bhakti* lies only in method, but not in goal. The former takes the path of negation and the latter, of affirmation. The Bhakta wants even in the end, to keep the knowledge of the lover, love and the beloved whereas the Advaitist wants to merge the three into one. The Bhaktas say: "it is no good to *be* sugar; it is better to *taste* sugar". They do not know what it is to become sugar. Their goal of love is to live with the beloved in the same place (*salokya*) in the same rank (*sarshti*) in his neighbourhood (*samipya*) and in close intimacy (*sayujya*).

Shankara, Sureshwara, Madhusudan, Vidyaranya, Chitsukha and other revered Vedantists were great devotees of their respective *Ishta-Devas* or chosen deities. Shankara had not only deep bhakti for his own *Guru* but for all deities of the enormous Hindu Pantheon, as Shiva, Ganga, Durga and others. His *Ishta-Devi* was the goddesss *Annapurna.* The hearts of men who have realised Vedanta are all-love, wide as the sky but deep as the ocean. They realise in mystic meditation (*samadhi*) that they themselves are absolute bliss, that they are born in bliss, they live in bliss and unto bliss they are transformed. Such great Souls or Mahatmas descend into the phenomenal world retaining their consciousness and serve the Self in every thing.

The modern man of the east or the west stands in great need of Bhakti. Jarring creeds and warring sects have converted human hearts and society into a playground of woe and fear. Creeds and Sectarianism cannot grow in the soil of genuine Bhakti and it is Advaita-Bhakti that unifies all and thus heals the bleeding heart of humanity. When true Bhakti germinates in the heart, here is the experience thus described :—

Sweet blow the winds,
And rivers spread sweetness,
The herbs are sweet
So are morn and night.
The dust of earth is sweet,
Sweet are the showers of Father Heaven,
Falling on sweet trees.
The Sun radiates it
And cows are sweetness incarnate.
Blessed Joy, Sweetness and Bliss.

मधु वाता ऋतायते ।
मधु क्षरंति सिंधवः ।
माध्वीर्नः संत्वोषधीः ।
मधुनक्तमुतोषसि मधुमत्पार्थिवꣳरजः ।
मधु द्यौरस्तु नः पिता ।
मधुमान्नोवनस्पतिर्मधुमाꣳअस्तु सूर्यः ।
माध्वीर्गावो भवंतु नः ॥
आनंदम् । मधुरम् । सौख्यम् ।

JAGADISWARANANDA

THE PHILOSOPHICAL CONFIRMATION OF THEOSOPHY

[**Philip Chapin Jones** is a scientific researcher and student whose sincere interest in Theosophical philosophy extends over a long period of years.—EDS.]

Probably very few of us pass through life without giving some thought—fleeting and fragmentary though it may be—to the fundamental nature of the universe, and to its underlying causes. For the most part, however, life and external nature are accepted with unhesitating thoughtlessness. Only at rare intervals are we enticed, by curiosity and wonder, to reflect on the meaning and explanation of the changing world around us. On such occasions, guided by vague subliminal instincts, we approach the problem by one or another of three paths. The most obvious, the one that seems to lead directly to our objective, is the collection and study of material facts. This is the method of science. Another approach leads through religion, or mysticism. In this direction knowledge is sought by inner inspiration. The third approach is through philosophy. It requires a study of the processes and powers of the mind, and the various deductions that may be made from primitive concepts.

A philosophical analysis of the fundamentals of our knowledge soon reveals a state of uncertainty as to the real nature of things, which is rather startling. Consider for the moment the desk on which I am writing. From the matter-of-fact point of view it is as definite, as tangible, and as indisputable an object as could be found, but on careful analysis this reality seems to vanish. We say it is brown, but the quality called brown is merely the mental reaction of our intellect to a stimulation of our retinal nerves by reflected rays of light. We say it is hard, but again, hardness is another mental reaction—here to nervous stimulation originating in our finger tips. We say it has a certain form—a rectangular top with four legs, etc., but still again this conclusion is reached because, as our hands move along the top, a point is reached where the sensation of hardness ceases, or as our line of vision moves along the top of the desk, a point is reached where our sensation of colour changes.

No matter how far the investigation is carried, a sufficiently acute analysis always reveals that our fundamental knowledge of external objects is a group of sensations: merely mental reactions. In the course of history many philosophers have investigated this fundamental uncertainty as to the true nature of external phenomena, and vainly sought some sounder basis of substantiality. Berkeley and Hume, among the British philosophers, have taken it particularly for their field of study.

The investigation is beset with difficulties, however, and usually results in little more than a recognition of the fundamental fact, and in a submission to philosophical scepticism.

In three thousand years of European history, only one philosopher has carried out his investigation of the sources and limits of cognition with sufficient acuity and grasp to be able to present a satisfactory outline of the nature and scope of human knowledge. In 1781, Immanuel Kant published the *Critique of Pure Reason*, which contained the results of his investigation of the limits of our ability to know. Because of its extreme difficulty, and perhaps because so few are really interested in the subject, the *Critique* has never exerted the influence it should have on the course of human thought. To the theosophist, however, and now—because of the disconcerting discoveries and theories of recent physics—to the scientist, it should be of particular significance.

Our ego, the thinking and perceiving self, has two faculties that are essential to the production of knowledge. One is the understanding: the rational faculty that, operating under the laws of logic, dissects, analyzes, and arranges all perceptions that come before it. It deals with mental images called concepts and not directly with external perceptions. The other is intuition, the faculty that receives impressions which the understanding then arranges, analyzes, and turns over to the ego as knowledge. Unfortunately the word intuition, in popular usage, has come to mean a sort of blind feeling for fact, as when we speak of woman's intuition; but the original meaning, and the one used exclusively here, is merely our perceiving faculty, associated for the most part with sensation. The reaction of these two faculties, understanding and intuition, produce what we term knowledge, not an absolute thing but one dependent on the laws of action of the two fundamental faculties that give rise to it.

Consider sound for example. Sounds are mental responses to vibrations in the air falling on the drums of our ears. The air is capable of vibrating at a wide range of rates, or frequencies. There may be very slow vibrations of two or three pulses per second and even less, or very fast ones up to the tens of thousands per second. Our ear does not recognize all these vibrations as sound, however. It has a more or less definite range from about 16 to 16,000 vibrations per second. Both above and below these limits, although the air may be vibrating in the same manner, no sound is perceived. Anything that we call sound must of necessity fall within these limits of vibrational speed. If our ears were of different construction, however, and were associated with an appropriate responding faculty we would then classify as sound, phenomena which with our present perceptive apparatus we either do not recognize at all, or

recognize as something distinctly different.

A similar situation exists with light—also a vibrational phenomenon. The range of vibrations that our eyes respond to as light, however, is much more restricted than that of sound. Our entire visual range is only a little over what would be called one octave in describing sound. Suppose we had a different ocular perceptive apparatus—one that could respond to a range vastly wider than this. We would then see, or rather perceive as light, phenomena which are at present either entirely unknown, or which are known as something completely different—perhaps as heat or electricity, possibly even as matter.

These examples, although they serve well enough to indicate the type of the dependence of our knowledge on our faculties of cognition, are in reality rather superficial. The dependence goes much deeper. Our basic settings of space and time are but the forms of our present faculties of knowing. We think of the external world as a pretty substantial and real thing, but the very space in which everything is placed is nothing but a form of our present state of consciousness. Returning to our perception of the desk, we can abstract, mentally, all the various sense perceptions: colour, hardness, etc. but the space the desk occupied we cannot remove, even in thought, because it is the form or matrix of our consciousness in which our faculties place and arrange the various sensations that, so joined, we know as external objects.

Time also is but the form or arrangement in which our faculties of consciousness place, not only external phenomena, but every thought and perception that can come before our mind. We can no more abstract time from phenomena than we can space, because time is not something we perceive through our senses but merely one of the forms of our consciousness. The sensations and perceptions we have may vary endlessly; we have no means of telling what they will be; but irrespective of their nature, they will all be arranged in time and space by our consciousness, because, since time and space are the forms of our present state of consciousness, things which cannot be properly placed in them cannot appear before our intellect as knowledge.

What things are in themselves, apart from our method of knowing them, we have no means of determining. What we now know as colour we would know as something entirely different had we a different form of consciousness. What we now see as the external world, would be perceived as something of an essentially different nature had we some other type of consciousness, one that did not have space and time as its forms. The most recondite researches of science are powerless to overcome this barrier, and to fathom the real nature of things, because they are thus rigidly bound by our present state of consciousness. When we hear of

some great scientific discovery that has at last revealed the ultimate nature of matter or of the universe, we may be sure that however interesting the disclosure may be, however suggestive of possible truths, it is but the discovery of another phenomenal aspect of the true reality, not that absolute reality itself.

This situation, which has been indicated by many philosophers and ably demonstrated and systematized by Kant, has also been clearly stated by H. P. Blavatsky in her various writings. She was careful to point out in the early pages of *The Secret Doctrine*—as in many other places—that we perceived, in our present state of consciousness, only aspects of reality. To the extent it is possible with present languages and human understanding, she indicated relationships and correspondences between the phenomenal and the real, and pointed out many things that had so far been overlooked by science. She stated that the phenomenon of life itself, and the various mental and psychic activities that science has so consistently ignored, are in themselves but aspects of the same underlying reality that in still another aspect appears as matter. A thoughtful perusal of her works indicates to us the significance of many things that, before, we had passed over unnoticed. Our whole attitude becomes changed, and we begin to direct our lives along lines more advantageous to the evolution of humanity as a whole, with which each and every one of us is indissolubly connected.

This dependence of our knowledge on our present form of consciousness may be very roughly indicated by the uncertainty we should be under as to the true colour of things had we a pair of blue spectacles permanently fastened before our eyes. With such an impediment to sight, we would be powerless to understand what the world would look like without it. Reds, for example, would appear black, and of what the sensation of red really was, we would have no conception. If we earnestly desired to obtain a knowledge of true colours, it would be necessary to devote our ingenuity first to discovering how the spectacles could be removed.

Likewise, if we are to attain to a truer knowledge of reality, we must adopt a somewhat similar course. As the study of things as they appear through blue spectacles, no matter how carefully undertaken, would never indicate to us how they would appear without the glasses, so the study of the external world by means of our present cognizing faculties will never reveal to us the true nature of reality. For this we need another form of consciousness, a form not bound by space and time and our other human limitations.

This is the great fact taught by occultism and verified by philosophy: one that science and the world at large have not yet come to realize. What we need to attain to a true knowledge is not a more acute and refined analysis of facts as we now perceive them, but a different perceptive faculty; our study should be the means of reaching a different and higher plane of consciousness.

The methods of attaining such a new state are indicated in *The Secret Doctrine*, but they are pointed out more specifically in a small book published after the appearance of the larger work: *The Voice of the Silence.* In it is laid down the general course of training to which we must subject ourselves if we truly wish to attain a knowledge of Reality. Why such a course of life as is there outlined should be necessary, we cannot say, of course, before we have mastered the higher consciousness. We must assume the method correct; we cannot hope to prove it true until after we have conquered it. Neither the practical teachings of *The Voice of the Silence* nor the theoretical knowledge of *The Secret Doctrine*, however, need be accepted on the word of H. P. Blavatsky alone. In all her works she recurrently insists that she is but passing on and reformulating the message that has been delivered many times before in the course of the world's history. A long line of great teachers have all indicated the same path, and that they have possessed a true knowledge, they have proved by indicating relations or phenomena which had heretofore been overlooked, by suggesting solutions to previously unanswered problems, or by predicting the occurrences of future events.

Among certain classes of people, however, there exists a prejudice against accepting any statements, or even seeking any knowledge, from sources of an occult or religious nature. There is, unfortunately, some ground for such a disinclination, because in this field deception is so easy, and has so often been practised. That in spite of all the false scents that have been given, and of all the wrong lanes indicated, there is one true path through the *terra incognita* of occultism, can be proved only by following the path itself, but we should not deceive ourselves with the thought that the way is easy.

A person educated along philosophical or scientific lines will never seek for a guide to knowledge in occultism, without first finding in his own field some indications of its probable or at least possible correctness. It is in conformance with the harmony and unity found throughout nature, however, that both philosophy and science, when carried far enough, converge toward the teachings of occultism. Like divergent paths on a spherical universe, all true roads to knowledge, if pursued far enough, ultimately merge into a common agreement.

PHILIP CHAPIN JONES

THE PROBLEM OF CONSCIOUSNESS

[**J. D. Beresford** writes his first thoughts on a problem of metaphysics and finds Hegel "faltering" and H. P. Blavatsky "clearer".—EDS.]

In common speech, there are many words that convey a definite effect to the mind and are accepted at their surface value without arousing the least curiosity. One of the most familiar, as it is, also, one of the most transcendental of these words, is "life". Its general implications are instantly recognisable. We have a large group of associations which come to mind at once when the word is mentioned, and within the limits of those associations, we are able to say with a reasonable intelligibility what we suppose life to be. If, however, we should be pressed to give an inclusive definition of the word "life," the associations of common experience must be enlarged. Life must be assigned, for example, to those "filter-passing" organisms below the limits of visibility, and if we descend in the scale from animal to vegetable, to find no recognisable division between the two orders, we begin to wonder whether life of some sort must not, also, be attributed to those substances which have been hitherto described as inorganic, and so to ask ourselves whether "life" is not an universal state of being, a fundamental condition of all matter? "The infinitesimal nucleus of the future man is composed of the same elements as a stone—of the same elements as the Earth, which the man is destined to inhabit," says Madame Blavatsky, (*The Secret Doctrine* II, 188) and for the moment we may accept the principle that so far as observational knowledge can take us, we are able to assign no division in this respect, between the organic and the inorganic.

A parallel line of research, obviously very closely related to this enquiry after a definition of life, is that which seeks the meaning of consciousness. Here, too, we begin with the familiar associations and descend from man, to animal, to insect, to protozoa, to plants, without being able at any stage to say with any assurance, that here without question consciousness ceases, that beyond this clearly recognisable division all impulses and movements may be assigned solely to a mechanical instinct to reflex action, to heliotropism, or to whatever other description we may find for those responses of a bee, a sea-anemone or a sun-flower, to which we deny any element of self-awareness.

Nevertheless certain differences obtrude themselves into our imaginative investigations of a parallel between life and consciousness. In the case of life, for instance, we are bound to postulate that it must be continuous in so far as it is manifested as the function of a complex organism. We recognise a moment, often beyond dispute

at which the congeries of cells that has been realised as a living, independent thing ceases, it may be with shocking abruptness, to manifest any further activity, and we can say that the animal, insect or plant in question is "dead". If we were correct in our assumption that matter without life is incapable of coherence, we may still assign a measure of vitality to the separate cells of which the subject under consideration was built, but the entity, which was the sum and vehicle of those cells' vital essence, has apparently ceased for ever to function as a whole.

In the case of consciousness, however, we may hesitate to postulate this continuity. Not only do we describe as states of "unconsciousness," sleep, anaesthesia, or any physical condition in which the individual is unable to relate himself to the phenomenal world about him; but introspection appears to reveal consciousness as being intermittent, or at least as varying very considerably in intensity.

Another difference between our two terms is provided by the fact that while life appears similar in its essence whether we regard a man or a plant, since in both cases our definition must apply without distinction to either the one or the other; we should certainly not attribute the same *kind* of consciousness to animal as to man; and as we descend in the scale of life, using as our measure a decreasing complexity of function, we find it more and more difficult to realise the possibility of any form of self-awareness.

The deduction that faces us as a consequence of these observations is that whereas life appears to have a single quality manifesting itself more or less abundantly according to the nature, rather than according to the complexity of the instrument, since the physical vitality of an animal or even a plant may exceed that of a human being; consciousness not only appears to manifest itself more vividly in the case of man than in other animals, but might, also, be described as different in kind. Moreover, it is possible to distinguish between different states of consciousness in the same individual, such as, in ascending order, (1) the consciousness of the dream-state in which we are unable to relate ourselves to the normal sequence of our personal lives, (2) the consciousness of common life, in which our awareness is largely directed to external objects and is only intermittently turned upon the self in relation to them, (3) the consciousness of self-realisation, when the attention is temporarily turned inwards, and we are aware of ourselves as an entity apart from any relation to external phenomena, and (4) the consciousness of the mystic, which transcends all physical experience.[1]

[1] Seven states of consciousness, corresponding to seven planes of being are known in Oriental Esotericism, but the four I refer to here are those which will be most readily recognised by the Western mind. Cf. *The Secret Doctrine*, I. 47.

It would appear, therefore, that in this research we are dealing with two forms of activity, always found in conjunction on the material plane, but different from one another both in essence and in function. It may, for example, be argued from these premises that life cannot manifest itself without developing some form of consciousness, however feeble. But the converse, namely that consciousness cannot exist without life, would not necessarily be true.

It must be borne in mind, however, that our investigation up to this point has been conducted solely in the world of objective phenomena, and that in speaking of life, we have regarded it only as that force which is able to animate matter, the simplest form of animation being, we suggest, the power of cohering. On this plane, we see life as a principle manifesting itself through matter as its sole instrument, and consciousness as needing the resultant combination in order to find expression.

Our phenomenology up to this point, therefore, demands three elements for its account of presentation on the material plane. The first is the primitive stuff of which matter is built. What that primitive stuff may be, the physicists cannot tell us, but in the ultimate form into which the atom can be theoretically resolved we still find that coherence postulated as the simplest manifestation of " life, " and the elemental " unit," (though it must be emphasised that this or, indeed, any other physical term we could apply, begs the fundamental question), still escapes all analysis. What immediately concerns us, however, is that for present purposes we recognise the combinations of this primitive stuff as a vehicle for that animating force which is our second element, manifesting itself through every degree of development from mere stability to the most complex forms of vitality,—evidencing incidentally in the process the Holistic principle that the combination of living cells is greater than the sum of its parts.

To these two elements, we have to add the third, which is consciousness, and according to the theory so briefly sketched in this article, may be prior to the other two, and,—to leap a gap that may be partly bridged later —may be the origin, as it will be also, the final resolution of the whole process of world-evolution, within our restricted temporal knowledge.

The justification of the leap taken in that last sentence demands another method of argument, since it cannot be made by any resort to phenomenal evidence. The conception, however, that consciousness is, in fact, the noumenon, devoid of all phenomenal attributes, is one that has inevitably confronted the greatest philosophers. Hegel appears to have admitted it in a passage of his " Phenomenology of Mind," but declined, or at least omitted, to face the full implications of his own logic. " To begin

with," he writes, " this active reason is aware of itself merely as 'an individual,' and must, being such, demand and bring forth its reality in an 'other'. Thereupon, however, its consciousness being lifted into universality, it becomes *universal* reason, and is consciously aware of itself as reason, as something already recognised in and for itself, which, within its mere consciousness, unites all self-consciousness"*. In these and other rather less explicit passages, Hegel seems to tremble on the brink of the larger discovery, as did, also, William James in his famous, although rather misleading metaphor of the " ocean of consciousness". Indeed, there has never been, nor can ever be, any other explanation of what may, for the sake of convenience, be called the problem of consciousness, a problem which has always been recognised as distinct from any other confronting the philosopher. (Science cannot, of course, by its own admission, touch the problem at all, though Sir Arthur Eddington has glanced at it, now and again, with an effect of slightly whimsical regret. There is, for example, a passage in his *Nature of the Physical World*, in which, after tracing the presentation of the material object to the brain by the physical apparatus of sight, he speaks of observed phenomena as knocking at the door of the mind (consciousness) and immediately departing,—a figure that has very subtle implications.

In making and ordering these notes on consciousness, I have so far attempted as nearly as may be to confine myself within the limits of logical reason. In this, as in many earlier articles of mine for THE ARYAN PATH, my primary object has been to illustrate how I, as a person of average intelligence with no special knowledge, have approached some of the vital questions of existence and have found in most instances that if my own mental processes have been stopped short of a true understanding of the great mysteries, my deductions have continually led me to the Outer Courts of the Ancient Wisdom-Religion. But although I write as a plain man to those who, like myself, have been confined to the circuitous path of reason, I have long realised that it is a path which can never reach the desired goal. Wherefore my excuse for this article is that it may serve as a sign-post, as an indication that the logic of the philosopher, when applied to such metaphysical abstractions as life and consciousness, lands us at the threshold dividing knowledge from the Inner Wisdom. From the brief argument I have here set out, for instance, the minds of those who are willing to accept my conclusions should be prepared to comprehend the further statement that "Consciousness implies limitations and qualifications, something to be conscious of, and

* *The Phenomenology of Mind*. By G. W. F. HEGEL. Vol. I, 5, English Translation by J. B. BAILLIE (1910).

someone to be conscious of it. But Absolute Consciousness contains the cogniser, the thing cognised and the cognition, all three in itself, and all three *one*" (*The Secret Doctrine*, I. 56).

This is a clearer and more inclusive statement than that contained in the faltering passage from Hegel, quoted above, and the acceptance of it will resolve the difficulties implicit in my own argument. In this conception of Absolute Consciousness—though we may never prove it by reason, since it is obvious that reason is but a single function of the Absolute Consciousness, and the part can never comprehend the whole, we find our three elements, matter, life and consciousness as aspects only of the "All-thing," an interdependent trinity on the phenomenal plane of being, having a single source of origin.

But, indeed, though we accept that explanation with the intellect, —all that I am here asking my readers to do—, we are, as yet, only at the first beginnings of Wisdom.

J. D. BERESFORD

The reincarnationists and believers in Karma alone dimly perceive that the whole secret of Life is in the unbroken series of its manifestations: whether in, or apart from, the physical body.—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Secret Doctrine* I, 238.

It has been stated before now that Occultism does not accept anything inorganic in the Kosmos. The expression employed by Science, "inorganic substance," means simply that the latent life slumbering in the molecules of so-called "inert matter" is incognizable. ALL IS LIFE, and every atom of even mineral dust is a LIFE, though beyond our comprehension and perception, because it is outside the range of the laws known to those who reject Occultism. "The very Atoms," says Tyndall, "seem instinct with a desire for life." Whence, then, we would ask, comes the tendency "to run into organic form"? Is it in any way explicable except according to the teachings of Occult Science?

"The worlds, to the profane," says a Commentary, "are built up of the known Elements. To the conception of an Arhat, these Elements are themselves collectively a divine Life; distributively, on the plane of manifestations, the numberless and countless crores of lives. Fire alone is ONE, on the plane of the One Reality: on that of manifested, hence illusive, being, its particles are fiery lives which live and have their being at the expense of every other life that they consume. Therefore they are named the "DEVOURERS" . . .—S. D. I, 248–50.

Wherever there is an atom of matter, a particle or a molecule, even in its most gaseous condition, there is life in it, however latent and unconscious. *"Whatsoever quits the Laya State becomes active life; it is drawn into the vortex of MOTION (the alchemical solvent of Life); Spirit and Matter are the two States of the ONE, which is neither Spirit nor Matter, both being the absolute life, latent." (Book of Dzyan, Comm. III., par. 18) . . . "Spirit is the first differentiation of (and in) SPACE; and Matter the first differentiation of Spirit. That, which is neither Spirit nor matter—that is IT—the Causeless CAUSE of Spirit and Matter, which are the Cause of Kosmos. And THAT we call the ONE LIFE of the Intra-Cosmic Breath."—The Secret Doctrine,* I, 258.

THE PATH OF TAGORE

[**Mulk Raj Anand, Ph. D.,** is a great admirer of the Indian Poet and sees in the latter's work a continuity of ancient Aryan thought.—EDS.]

There is a view of the nature of history which reduces the idea of progress to the fact of a geometrical cycle. According to this view the successive generations of men do not add anything new to the total sum of our essential knowledge, but merely work out certain old principles to their logical conclusions, or reinterpret the ideas of the past ages. Rabindra Nath Tagore seems to me to belong to the last class of men, *i.e.* to the category of geniuses who have dedicated themselves to the rediscovery of ancient truths.

He has described to his friend C. F. Andrews, how the Poet was born in him.

It was morning; I was watching the sunrise from Free School Lane. (Calcutta.) A veil was suddenly withdrawn, and everything became luminous. The whole scene was one perfect music, one marvellous rhythm. The houses in the street, the men moving below, the little children playing, all seemed parts of one luminous whole,—inexpressibly glorious. The vision went on for seven or eight days. Every one, even those who bored me, seemed to lose their outer barrier of personality; and I was full of gladness, full of love, for every person and every tiniest thing. . . . That morning in Free School Lane was one of the first things which gave me the inner vision, and I have tried to explain it in my poems. I have felt ever since that that was my goal, to express the fullness of life in its beauty as perfection.

It is of Tagore as one who has (however independently), rediscovered the meaning of the ancient Hindu lore that I want to write about in this essay, as the poet who has been travelling on a voyage of rediscovery along the old *Aryan Path*.

The adoption of such a standpoint, is indeed not without support from the poet himself. He writes in the *Sadhana*:

To me the verses of the Upanishads and the teaching of Buddha have ever been things of the spirit, and therefore, endowed with boundless vital growth; and I have used them both in my own life, and in my preaching as instinct with individual meaning for me as for others, and awaiting their confirmation my own special testimony, which must have its value because of its individuality.

The songs that flowed out of Rabindra Nath after his vision were, he says, "the first throwing of his inner self outwards". In them he has "celebrated the sudden opening of a gate". They embody for him "the joy of attaining the Infinite within the finite".

How precisely has he actualised this ideal of attaining the Infinite within the finite? "God finds Himself by creating," he writes in the *Stray Birds*, and in his long poem, *Creation, Conservation and Destruction*, he has epitomised his view of Reality in the following parable: Brahma,

the Absolute, the All-Inclusive, the All-comprehending spirit of the cosmos, is buried in contemplation. He awakes and desiring joy sings the hymn of creation, by which He splits Himself, His Oneness, into the manyness of the universe. Vishnu blows his conch and order is brought about in the vast multiplicity of time and space. Life flourishes, the hopes and fears of men are centred in the realisation of unity with the Eternal. Then Lakshmi, the World's Desire, comes out of the golden lotus in the lake Manasa-sarovar on which Vishnu has fixed his gaze. The world is corrupted. Humanity is bored and ignorant, and has forgotten its real goal. Some there are, however, who have kept the ideal in sight, and they wish that Brahma might re-awaken and renew the World. The Supreme God appears and orders Siva to destroy the evil rampant in the world. The Lord of the dancers dances his cosmic dance, and tramples on the incarnation of vice and ignorance. Another golden age begins. Brahma buries himself deep in contemplation again.

The gods are treated by Rabindra Nath as personifications of the various aspects of the philosophical Absolute, and the burden of the whole myth of inner verity seems to be the reaction of the poet as a human being to an impulse of the cosmic life. In its metaphor and imagery it carries my mind to the beautiful hymn of creation in the *Rig-Veda*, which the Upanishads crystallised in the scientific inquiry which the *Svetasvatara*, postulates with unerring precision: "Whence are we born, where do we live, and whither do we go?" The answers of the ancient *rishis*, are in their definitions of the *Atman*, the *Brahman*, and *Ananda* respectively.

Says Prajapati in the *Chhandogya Upanishad*, "this body is mortal and all is subject to death. It is the abode of the Self (*Atman*), which is immortal and without body. He is the person of the eye, the eye itself is the instrument of seeing. He who thinks 'let me smell this,' he is the Self, the nose is the instrument of smelling". According to the *Mundaka Upanishad* the Self is 'this whole universe'. "The moon and the stars are its eyes, the four quarters of the sky its ears, the wind its breath." *Brahman* is the objective counterpart of the subjective *Atman*, and is "that in which these things are born, that in which when born they live, and that into which they enter at death". (*Taittiriya Upanishad*).

Sensed through the body, the ultimate reality (of which both the *Atman* and the *Brahman* are two aspects) is *Virat* (the Cosmos), perceived by the mind it is *Hiranyagarbha* (the soul of the world); comprehended by the intellect it is *Isvara* (the God of religion); finally realised through intuition it is *Ananda* (pure bliss). This last is the highest goal of life say the

Upanishads,—the end of all our endeavours. We cannot define it in relative terms.

It is interesting to notice the parallel these urgings from the vaster life find in Rabindra Nath.

The poet has given the key to the secret of the Self in the *Crescent Moon:*

> My beloved is ever in my heart
> That is why I see him everywhere.

The soul of nature is for him the outer aspect of reality, the *Brahman*, and just as the Vedic poets considered the *Brahman* and the *Atman* to be the subjective and objective counterparts of one and the same Reality, and built up the entire fabric of sacrificial rites on the assumption that the self is identical with nature, that the elements of the rite are one with the elements of the universe, so our poet regards the world around him as a "fairy universe where the stars talk and the sky stoops down to amuse him, and all nature comes to his windows with trays of bright toys".

The All-Pervasive Cosmic Being, is in nature, thinks Rabindra Nath. He sought joy in creating the Universe, in establishing "duality for His realisation". So He split Himself into the Self and the not-self, into *Isvara* and *maya*, for "it is the joy that creates the separation in order to realise through obstacles the union," the joy that is the mainspring of creation:

> The joy that makes the earth flow over in riotous excess of the grass, the joy that sets the twin brothers life and death, dancing over the wide world, the joy that sweeps in with the tempest, shaking and waking all life with laughter, the joy that sits still with its tears on the open red lotus of pain, and the joy that throws everything it has upon the dust, and knows not a word.—*Gitanjali.*

In choosing the site for the Bolpur school he had the same idea in view:

> We do not want to-day temples of worship and outward rites and ceremonies. What we really want is an *Asram*. We want a place where the beauty of nature and the noblest pursuits of man are in the sweetest harmony. Our temples of worship are there, where outward nature and the human soul meet in union.

The Infinite manifests certain aspects and qualities of Itself to men like an open book, but only to those men who have eyes to see, and ears to hear:

> I woke and found his letter with the morning. When the night grows still and the stars come out one by one, I will spread it on my lap and stay silent. The rustling leaves will read it to me aloud, and the rushing stream will chant it.—*Fruit Gathering.*

The observation of nature, through the limitations of our senses only gives bare glimpses into the secret of Reality. The realisation of the Absolute as against perceiving It, is to be brought about according to Upanishads through intuition. In ancient India where philosophy supplied the inspiration of the soul to all the arts and sciences, the writers on poetics and the rhetoricians adopted this lofty ideal of the *Brahma-Vidya*. Rabindra Nath has been to realise the "soul of literature," "the enjoyment which is disinterested".

He regards poetry as prayer, something by which he might plunge back into the *mysterium tremendum* of life, and by which he might adumbrate realities that cannot be formulated. He seeks to tap the resources of his inner consciousness, and endeavours to create for himself a mirror of the cosmos. His

> soul seems to be aching for expression in the world's endless rhythm of lines and colours, music and movements hints and whispers and in all the suggestions of the inexpressible which finds its harmony in the ceaseless longing of the human heart to make the Person manifest in its own creations.—*Personality.*

The poets of old were not, however, content merely to suggest the Infinite in their creations; they were poet-philosophers who sang in order to realise the Infinite, poetry being to them an aid to contemplation. The realisation of the Supreme Ideal meant to them not only the beginning of an attempt to make Him explicit for the benefit of humanity, but the end of all desires and passions, leading to perfect speechlessness.

Has Tagore achieved the ideal?

The answer is no. He points out the difficulties inherent in such a task, and clearly explains his failure. He says in that revealing testament of his faith the *Sadhana:*

> The vision of the Supreme One is a direct and immediate intuition, not based on any ratiocination or demonstration at all. Intellect is like a Railway station, but the Station platform is not our home. It is only a step in the process of comprehending reality. The way to the realisation of the Self lies along a very thorny path.

Living in *Kali-yuga*, the limitations of Tagore's finitude have been too heavy for his heart, for that heart cannot resist the temptation to love and adore the concrete shapes and forms of experience:

> I am listless I am a wanderer in my heart.....
> O Farthest End, O the keen call of thy flute!
> I forget, I ever forget,
> That the gates are shut ever more in the house where I dwell alone.

In the despair of his futility, in the abject misery of his incapacity to attain the pure bliss of *Ananda*, he can only cry as a child for his mother, as a lover for his beloved: "*I want thee, only thee.*"

A result like this was in Rabindra Nath's case inevitable. He has been primarily a poet, and only secondarily a philosopher. As a poet he expresses the lofty idealism of the Upanishads not in its purity, but as it has passed like a dogma into the currency of every day life in India, and become a part and parcel of the race consciousness of that country, gathering with it all the accretions of a tender and indulgent humanism. He loves God, but although striving to remove the barrier of finitude which separates him from the Infinite, worships Him through metaphors and imagery. Thus his Poet self is unable to realise the implications of his philosopher self, and is just content to play hide and seek with Reality.

MULK RAJ ANAND

THE PATHS

THE GOOD, THE BEAUTIFUL, THE TRUE

[**Christmas Humphreys** is an English Buddhist, an indefatigable worker for his cause and President of the Buddhist Lodge in London.—EDS.]

There is a Buddhist saying: "The ways to the Goal are as many as the lives of men". For each the Path is different, yet the difference lies in the pilgrim and not in the Way. To attempt to classify these differences in a few distinctive divisions is a natural tendency in all who study that nebulous land which lies between purely sensuous existence and the world of comparative Reality in which the truly Great Ones of the earth, forever dwell. Within this country souls that have at last grown weary of the things of sense attempt to find that inward path which has its first beginnings in each human heart and its common end in That which is beyond our ken. Yet even as a mountain stream, however feeble, will on reaching the plain begin to cut for itself a definite though sinuous course towards the sea, so those who

> wearied of illusion,
> Set forth on the last long journey—home,

will choose the manner of their journey and the path to tread.

This love of classification, a product of the lower, analytic mind, has at times divided the pilgrim types into many groups. There are those who say that all who seek the light are either predominantly occultists or mystics. The former, they say, are those who climb the ladder of progress rung by rung, mastering each plane and sphere of consciousness before attempting the next, while the mystic, developing his inner sight, the eye of intuition, sees the glory of the Oneness from which he has temporarily strayed, and in his all-consuming yearning for reunion moves onward quite indifferent to the knowledge to be found in the world of illusion which he craves to leave.

Again, there are those who divide aspiring souls into those who strive to help humanity, the Bodhisattvas of mankind, and those who strive for personal perfection. Needless to say, these are all false antitheses when viewed from the absolute, for the occultist must finally lose his selfhood if he would gain true Wisdom, while the mystic cannot be perfect until he has mastered the final secrets of the Universe. In the same way the Bodhisattva, by forgetting self unveils the Self, while he that strives to perfect his own unruly nature thereby sets an example to all mankind.

There is, however, another classification, better known in the West, where it forms the Western equivalent of the threefold division of *Gnana-*, *Bhakti-*, and *Karma-Yoga*. For convenience it may be described as a division of

humanity into those who predominantly follow the paths of the Good, the Beautiful and the True.

The Good represents ethics, "Right Action" as the fourth step in the Noble Eightfold Path, and the goal is to discover and perform "one's duty to one's neighbour". At the best this type develops into the philanthropist and saint.

The Beautiful involves the realm of art. The will is here directed more subjectively and the artist is less concerned with the lives of his fellow men.

The True represents that knowledge which when applied will ripen into wisdom. Science and philosophy are to be found under this head. As in the case of the artist, the creative ability may or may not be dedicated to the common weal, though its products will eventually improve the whole.

The Perfect Man will of course be a blending of all three, but it is curious to note how far an individual can progress along his own particular line while yet remaining lamentably deficient in the qualities of the others. The greatest of humanitarians may be classed as an ignorant man, the greatest of artists may be vicious and immoral, while the scientist may care for little save his own advancement and the power which knowledge brings. Sometimes the three primary colours are allocated to the three paths, red being the colour of action and yellow the symbolic colour for mind. Blue is the colour usually associated with devotion or mysticism, and would here represent beauty, the three colours between them forming the white light which is the symbol of perfection and purity. Recent research in healing by coloured light would be of value as applied in this connection, but space forbids a further analysis here.

As with all segregated forces, each has its positive and negative aspect, its virtues and defects. The analogy of the dual influence of each planet in astrology leaps to the mind.

If we turn to examine these three main paths in detail it will at once be noted that so far as the West is concerned the order above given betrays their relative importance. Ethics are valued higher than art, and art than 'mere' philosophy, although the latter in its material aspect of Science is claiming an ever increasing proportion of general interest. The tremendous value given to ethics in the West, to the detriment of the other two, needs some explaining. Perhaps the teachings of the Church are responsible. For a thousand years innumerable mouths have thundered forth from pulpit, platform and stage the need of purity in action, of doing and being 'good,' in brief, of obeying the Ten Commandments of the Jewish code. Where has a voice been raised to tell us to study the laws of the Universe and man, to examine the technical make-up of our own spirit, soul and body and the inter-

relation between them and all other forms of life and where shall we hear an exhortation to be beautiful in thought and word and deed? Be good and you may be stupid; be 'Christian' in behaviour and you may ignore the beautiful. Unfortunately 'ignore' is too mild a word. Regarding things of the sense as snares for the unguarded soul, the Church, while itself an inspiration for the greatest art, has frowned on forms of it which lay outside its own religious pale. He that portrayed the beauty of the human form might be an artist but he was handling fire and imperilling his "immortal soul". The good and the beautiful were only compatible on terms laid down by the Church. It is true that in the cities where culture congregates, philosophers and poets are respected for their own peculiar qualities, but in the countryside the ideal is the just and sober, the honourable, upright man. The rest are tolerated and that is all. If this be an exaggeration of fact at least it marks a general principle.

On behalf of this path much may be said. At all times, and more than ever to-day, ethics are the basis of progress. Again and again we read in the records of the Great Ones of the earth that motive is everything, and ethics alone supply the ideal motive with which to acquire and use all knowledge and the terrible power that knowledge brings. Of what avail to discover the secrets of nature if this knowledge be only used for the destruction of one's fellow men? In the same way the artist, who is of the three the creator in whatever medium, needs at least a glimpse of the aim and tendency of evolution, the perfection of the whole. In this connection it is curious to note the debasing effect on morals of the modern trend of science to place precision and efficiency on a pedestal of its own. How often we hear in sneering tones the condemnation, for such it is, that someone at least 'means well'? Yet what is the use of efficiency if it be not applied to benevolent, that is to say, 'well-meaning' ends?

"Cease to do evil; learn to do good; cleanse your own heart; such is the teaching of the Buddhas." Certainly ethics begin negatively, by ceasing to do evil. Later they develop into positive well-doing and philanthropy, and so in time to sainthood in the Western meaning of the term.

But the virtuous have their vices. Those who overstress the good are often painfully narrow-minded, and prejudiced even against all forms of virtue with which at the moment they do not happen to agree, while their eyes are blinded to the beauties which seem to them the snares of sense, but which are in fact the attempts of those who seek the beautiful to enshrine in perishable materials the beauty which is in itself above all form.

To enter the path of beauty is to enter a world of its own. Unheeding of surrounding circumstance, the artist is ever at war with his chosen medium in his

efforts to express therein his reactions to the beauty which overfloods his soul. His eyes are ever on the ideal form, that Noumenon of beauty which dwells in the upper reaches of the mind and which only the eye of intuition can perceive. Being of a far more delicate inner mechanism, the artist naturally appears unbalanced to the unimaginative mind, yet if he never knows the 'level ways of calm security' of temperament, he feels and knows the heights and depths of human joys and suffering that the men of deeds and thought have yet to find. Living as he does in a world of beauty far more 'real' than daily life, is it surprising if he is apt to scorn the conventional morality and manners of his fellow men? His urge is to create, not to obey, to bring the whole of earth and heaven so much 'nearer to the heart's desire,' not to confine his mighty wings within the confines of mere platitude.

Nor does he strive for knowledge beyond the technique of his art. Every artist is at heart a mystic, and in him above all other types the personality is indeed a concealing mask which hides the delicate sensibility of the soul within. Oblivious of form as such, the artist strives to understand the form's significance, asking of any incident or thing not what it is so much as what it means. To him above all the world of sense is a world of ***maya***, and the fact that he seems to be occupied exclusively with his reactions to things of sense is one of the paradoxes in which alone truth lies concealed. Knowledge, save as it helps him to master his technique, is therefore useless in that it only tells him *about* its subject, whereas he strives to know his subject by an inner identity of consciousness unknown to the objective scientist. What does a master musician care for science and the detailed knowledge of Nature and her laws? He does not study what is made; he makes. With eyes that never leave the vision of Reality he moulds the plastic substance which is Life itself into a living reflection of the glorious Ideal. Why should he know or care for the rules of conduct or of nature's processes who cries: "I am above all laws who *am* the Law, above creation who am one with the Creator, nor do I care for Universal processes who *am* the Universe!"

Why is it that every Teacher speaks of ethics and philosophy alone? When will a Master Craftsman come forth into the world of men and teach the timeless Message in terms of music, sculpture, and poetry, raising buildings which shall synthesise the laws of harmony and line, and once more consecrating sound, the sacred Word, to spiritual ends? Is there not here a field for man's creative effort in which to wean him from the field of war? Of what avail to analyse each branch of knowledge unless one knows the laws of rhythm which unite the whole?

Those who follow beauty have their failings. When they mis-

take the outward form of beauty for its self they lapse into the realms of sensuality or mawkish, untrue sentiment, or else confound the laws of rhythm and harmony in form with the ideal beauty which created them, so producing a meaningless confusion, a bastard body which has never known a soul.

The path of the True, like the mind which is its servant-lord, is dual in manifestation. In its lower aspect, as the way of progress for the separative, analytic mind, it covers all activity involving clear precision of thought and detailed accuracy, and as such is an admirable mental training, while in the higher levels of the abstract and synthetic it embraces all philosophy and metaphysics with their kindred sciences, from which it mounts in time to a realm to be considered later where the three paths meet in one.

To distinguish a line of cleavage between the two is of course impossible, for many a science, like mathematics, begins in the lower realm and in its higher flights is merged in the highest principles of the Man-Universe, while metaphysics and cosmogony are examples of the converse process, in which truth upon the abstract levels of thought can be and is reflected down into the laboratory. Those who tread this path are the true magicians of the world, whose knowledge of the laws of Nature slowly gives them dominion over Nature and her processes. As *The Voice of the Silence* says, "Help Nature and work on with her; and Nature will regard thee as one of her creators and make obeisance".

The "beginningless beginning" of the Wheel or Chain of Causation is sometimes given as *avidya*, Ignorance, and sometimes as Desire. Yet ignorance is the father of desire, and the sword of truth alone can slay *avidya*; hence the potential value of this path, but one of its most common vices is the dedication of this knowledge to unholy ends. Better were it not to know than to use one's knowledge for selfish purposes, for of such are mankind's gravest enemies made.

Knowledge for its own sake is of no more value than art for art's sake. Just as the *raison d'être* of art is to reflect the Beautiful, so knowledge is but valuable to the extent that it enshrines the True. A specialist has been wittily described as one who learns more and more about less and less, and the implication is obvious.

Here analysis ends, and the mind springs back to its inherent synthesis. Distinctions are only useful to the extent that they enable one to realise the different parts of the whole, and the Path is one. If it be asked what part Religion plays in this synthetic analysis, the answer is that in its lower aspect of unending 'services' it partakes of all three, involving as it does a certain amount of teaching, beauty and example in right conduct, but in its highest form it is at once the Path, the Pilgrim and the Goal.

The same applies to Yoga and

its many forms. Karma Yoga is the path of action, a training to do good which of course involves becoming good. Bhakti Yoga, union by devotion, is the path of art and mysticism, and it has been shown how art is but mysticism applied to form. The pursuit of the True is Gnana Yoga, the development of the mind by meditation and complete control.

The triple division may be found in Western psychology. The mind, emotions and body is a common analysis of our personal make-up, but here again modern medicine is rediscovering the essential relation between the three. Mind and emotions interact and the health of the body in turn reacts on these. Verily these three, wherever found, are a perfect trinity.

Further proof, for those who delight in proof, that the three paths meet in one is found in the experience of those who, reaching the higher realms of one of them, join hands with others who have trodden a different road. Even as the arts themselves become at a certain level interchangeable, so those who tread the different paths arrive in time at a point where " Beauty is truth, truth beauty," and the two are one.

The inter-relation of the arts is once more dawning on the human mind. Music by some is seen as colour; the loveliest gems of architecture are heard by others in terms of sound, and colour can be smelt. No less certain is the ultimate union of the triple path. There are brilliant mathematicians who arrive at seeing the abstract forms of the laws they handle, and metaphysicians who find in abstract formulæ the secrets of the Universe, while many an engineer has developed a sense of beauty in the sweeping rhythm and flow of modern machinery. In Bach's immortal music, however, is found perhaps the highest synthesis. Where was there lovelier music, and yet each masterpiece is a triumph of architecture, a lesson in cosmogenesis, a miracle of mathematics, and the mystic's vision of the inexpressible Ideal, and if this ecstasy of understanding be not Religion in its truest because most tenuous form, when the awakening eye of Buddhi sees in a blaze of light the gateway of the common Goal, then all the exhortations of the Great Ones to unveil the 'Light within' have been pronounced in vain. Such spiritual heights, however, are yet but for the few, and those who tramp the roads which lead towards them will, if they be thoughtful, find that for a while at least they move in preference along the pathway either of the Good, the Beautiful or the True.

CHRISTMAS HUMPHREYS

KALIDASA—STRAY THOUGHTS

[**Charles King** formerly Boden Sanskrit Scholar in the University of Oxford is the translator of the *Cloud Messenger of Kalidasa*.—EDS.]

As regards the form of his work, Kalidasa is one of the most versatile of poets. Milton is the only other poet I know from whom we have living work in the epic, the dramatic, and the lyric forms. Camoens and Lope de Vega were equally versatile, and the latter, especially, much more prolific, but they are remembered now for their success in one style only, Camoens for his epic, Lope de Vega for his drama, and most of the rest of their work is practically forgotten and unread even in their own country. But Kalidasa is remembered in the triple capacity, and not only remembered but read.

He is, however, essentially a lyric poet. He is a voice that in the night of Time cried out on beauty. He sings of love, happy at the last, and havened after tempest: he richly paints the Indian scene, the Indian year.

But though I hold this view of his genius and find in the ***Cloud-Messenger*** greater perfection of art, albeit less sustained human interest, than in ***Śakuntala***, nevertheless there is a strong didactic vein running through all his work; herein again he resembles Milton. The Greeks regarded the poet as a prophet, an interpreter of the gods to men, a teacher of morality; Aristophanes, for instance, in the ***Frogs*** makes this view the basis of his judgment of the superiority of Aeschylus over Euripides. Kalidasa certainly fulfilled the Greek idea of the function of the poet. He " lived with the bright gods of elder time": his religion was a living thing to him, and the nobility of his religion and of his philosophy shine through his work like a beacon-light.

One thing that may be noticed is the catholicity of his Hinduism. He is traditionally credited with having been a worshipper of Siva and this would appear from the ***Cloud-Messenger*** to be extremely likely. He there shows himself familiar with the worship of the " Lancer " god at the shrine Mahākāla in his beloved Ujjain, the city " whose fellow earth hath not " and which is " as a fragment fair of heaven ". He speaks nevertheless most reverently and philosophically of the rival god Vishnu. In the tenth canto of the ***Raghuvaṁśa***, the gods, oppressed by a giant adversary, betake themselves to Vishnu, seeking aid. They sing a hymn to the god, of which the following stanzas are given in Professor Ryder's translation :—

O thou who didst create this All,
Who dost preserve it, lest it fall,
Who will destroy it and its ways,
To thee, O triune Lord, be praise.
As into heaven's waters run
The tastes of earth—yet it is one,
So thou art all the things that range
The universe yet dost not change,

Far, far removed, yet ever near
Untouched by passion, yet austere:
Sinless, yet pitiful of heart:
Ancient yet free from age—Thou art.

Here Vishnu appears as the One Supreme God, Immanent and Transcendent. He is Triune comprehending the usual trinity of Brahmā, Vishnu and Siva, and spoken of in terms which are more usually reserved for Brahma. Kalidas gives a hymn of praise to Brahma in the second canto of the *Kumarasambhavam*, the epic of the "Birth of the War God," and it occurs to me that it may well have been from a translation of this that Emerson drew some of the material for his well-known poem *Brahmā*.

The catholicity of Kalidasa is further evidenced by his respectful reference to Buddha at the end of the play *Urvasi won by Valour*.

As Atri the sage of the Immortals to Brahmā the creator; as Buddha to the moon; as our king to Buddha; so thou, O Prince art like to thy father, in all qualities that men love.

Kalidasa had the true Hindu belief in the virtue of meditation: and a good deal of the action of his poems passes in hermitages. In the first canto of the *Birth of the War God*, Siva is leading a life of ascetic meditating upon a mountain peak. He goes so far, when his destined bride Parvati approaches, as to "allow her to serve him, though her charms were calculated to hinder mental abstraction," but does not relax, and Parvati herself is driven to undertake ascetic rigours, dressed in bark. Raghu, in the poem dealing with his dynasty, retires to a hermitage to prepare for the death of his mortal part, till after years of meditation he is released, attaining union with the eternal spirit which is beyond all darkness. The fairy in the *Cloud-Messenger* is exiled among "the hermitages of Rama-peak, whose pools are by Sita's bathings sanctified". Moreover, of course, the major part of the action of *Śakuntala* passes in a hermitage. Śakuntala herself is a hermit-maiden, though to western minds mixed hermitages such as that to which she belongs are somewhat novel. Religion and love blend in the mind of the King when he sees her:

She is God's vision, of pure thought
Composed in his creative mind;
His reveries of beauty wrought
The peerless pearl of womankind.
So plays my fancy when I see
How great is God, how lovely she.

This reminds us that there is in this play a certain amount of didactic matter about the duty of women, from the Hindu point of view. The charioteer cannot interrupt the "Father of the Gods" because he is explaining to his wife Aditi "in answer to her question, the duties of a faithful wife". These are elaborated by the father of the hermitage in sending Śakuntala forth, in a speech reminiscent, in style, of Polonius:—

Obey your elders; and be very kind
To rivals; never be perversely blind
And angry with your husband, even though he
Should prove less faithful than a man might be;
Be courteous to servants as you may,
Not puffed with pride in this your happy day;
Thus does a maiden grow into a wife;
But self-willed women are the curse of life.

The introduction, at the end of *Śakuntala*, of the Father and the Mother of the Gods as characters in the play shows Kalidasa very much at home with his religion. The Greek dramatists did not introduce Zeus or Hera, so far as we know, into any of their plays, certainly not into any which have been preserved. We have to go to the medieval English "mystery" plays for the comparable introduction of "God the father". Kalidasa's Kashyapa and Aditi are the more companionable, for their sole function is to converse with the mortal characters about the unravelling of the plot, whereas "God" in the English plays though he converses, for instance, with Abraham in the Chester Pageant of Abraham, Isaac, and Melchisedek, is mainly confined to general speeches, based broadly on the Bible.

Apart from all this, there is a strain of true spirituality pervading the work of Kalidasa. As an instance of this we may quote the beginning of that conventional drama of court intrigue, the earliest play of the poet, *Malavika and Agnimitra*:

I see her who shines like the three Vedas incarnate,
Accompanied by knowledge of the Supreme Soul.

It is a peculiarly Indian characteristic—and a very welcome one—to find so abstract and philosophical a simile for womanly glory.

Of the didactic vein which runs through even the most concentrated lyric work of Kalidasa, that very beautiful poem, *Cloud-Messenger*, furnishes several examples. The doctrine of "Noblesse oblige," for instance, is invoked by the fairy in speaking to the cloud,—"For the wealth of Nobleness hath fruit in peace of Sorrow's pain". (Stanza LIII). And the peculiar Indian worship of merit, contrasting favourably with the Western adulation of success, is quaintly expressed in the saying,

Better pray in vain to Virtue than of Dullness win desire. (Stanza VI)

Men in India have debated where Kalidasa was born, and of what mother. For us it is sufficient that he was born, like all poets, in Heaven, and drank the milk of Paradise before he came to earth in Hindustan. And there was a spiritual quality and interest in his art from which much may be learnt.

C. R. KING

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

AVATARAS, BODHISATVAS AND TIRTHANKARAS

[**Professor S. V. Venkateswara** is familiar to our readers as a thought-provoking writer. This article is not a review but is a result of a perusal of two recent publications.*—EDS.]

In the Vedas we have a religion of cheerfulness and optimism. They pray to the bright and friendly powers of Nature. There is the idea of sin and shortcoming, but also faith in the certitude of forgiveness for the penitent sinner. There is no idea of the eternity or eternality of sin or of its periodical recurrence in the cyclic order of time.

The masses of mankind are cast in a common mould. They are beset with the ills to which the flesh is heir. There is no inclination to pursue what is noble and good. Sometimes there is a conscious surrender and helpless submission to the potency of driving forces. "I know the right, but do not practise it. I know what would be wrong to do, and yet dare not refrain from doing it," says Duryodhana in the *Mahābhārata*. Political power may persecute those who are in the right path. The very protectors of the people become their oppressors. Institutions intended to safeguard individual liberty and religious conscience, degenerate into strongholds of fanatical and inquisitorial tyranny. Society has to be saved from king, priest, prince, or pope or a peasantry run mad. The wages of sin is death; but the death sentence has to be meted out. The doctrine of original sin does not apply. There is a see-sawing of the forces of right and wrong, and now the one prevails and then the other. Virtue is often veiled and weak and too noble to defend itself by methods which would do harm to the other side. So the grace of God has to descend on the vice-ridden world till the balance should be restored. As the day is darkest before dawn, the height and summit of human suffering should be reached before the Avatāra appears. Then there is the extirpation of vice as by a surgical operation and stability and sanity reign in place of terror and chaos.

Hence the idea of the Avatāra. As Sri Krishṇa says in the *Gita*, "for the protection of the good and the punishment of the wicked and holding aloft the banner of righteousness I am born from age to age, whenever the floral rapture of lily virtue is crushed under the iron heel of ascendent vice". The doctrine is not that of the ascent of man till he reaches the godhead, but of the descent of god to help the striving good and stamp out an overweening vice. The descent of god is not to be conceived as a single phenomenon where the whole essence of Eternity is imprisoned in mortal flesh. It consists of a series of such acts interspersed in time and place. This is described in the 10th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita*: "There is no end to my incarnations, Oh Conqueror of every new realm, whatever is great, holy, serene or pure, whatever is full of strength or filled with grace, know thou, that there is a manifestation of some element of my divine power."

II

The incipient ideas of Avatāra are pre-Buddhistic in origin. They belong to the Brāhmaṇa period of the Vedic age and are illustrated by the Avatāras of Vishṇu. God appears as Fish and moves along the waters, propelling the boat, in which are deposited the seeds of future creation. This legend of the deluge appears for the first time in the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*. The Semitic version is a tame echo of the boat on the waters and of the laughter, crying and bursting into song figuratively described in the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*. Land slowly emerges. The divine Boar helps to give it consistency and make it fit for tillage, and a broad expanse of arable land has floated on the back of the Divine Tortoise. This triple agency in creation, represents God as power intent on helping life, vitality, and vigour to emerge anew from the valley of the shadow cast by Death—*Pralaya*. The reign of moral law in the cosmos thus built, is illustrated by Narasimha. It is the Descent of Divine Wrath on irrate egoism and blind fanaticism, which would spare neither the innocence of a child nor the devotion of a wife. Trivikrama teaches the angle of cosmic vision to one, who, in the infatuation of power, sought the centre and circumference of all in the Ego and the Vanity Fair.

The emergence of the *Civilitas* is next in evidence. In Parasu Rama we have the social triumph of Patriarchy over promiscuity and polyandry, the stage of forest clearance preparatory to agricultural life, and the reclamation of marshy and waterlogged regions lying along the coast. Śri Rama is the ideal king who repressed the wicked and ruled in affluence and popularity. His glory was writ large on the landscapes of human heart and spirit. It was proclaimed by the heavens which sent down showers in season to quicken the responsive earth and the ever-balmy air. If Balarāma was eternally at the plough, tilling and distilling, Sri Krishṇa adapted the Indian ideal of the State to the hard realities of altered political conditions. The messenger of peace advocates war to the knife and once in, it must be fought out. It is a religious synthesis of peace, but not at any price, for there cannot

* *The Bodhisatva Doctrine*. By HAR DAYAL. (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd. London. 18*s*.)

2. *Jainism in North India*. With Illustrations and Maps. By C. J. SHAH, M. A. (Longmans, Green & Co., London. £2 2*s*.)

be any hobnobbing with the devil or compromise with conscience. Vice and Injustice stalking abroad must be extirpated at any cost by the soldiers of God. And duty must be done regardless of consequences: she is the stern daughter of the voice of God.

III

In the 6th century B. C. our religion was at the parting of the ways. Waves of pessimism succeeded the cheery optimism of the Veda and the Vedanta. Humanity was struck with horror at the potency of the world, flesh and devil. It sought refuge in cloistered seclusion, and flesh was mortified to save the soul from fire. The Hindu *Sanyasin*, the Buddhist *Arhat* and the Jain *Śramaṇa* sought by these means to eradicate the intoxicants (*Āsravas*) of sense-desire, love of existence, and ignorance of speculative opinion. It was believed that by virtue of this discipline one could cross the ocean of deaths and births; attain the pure nature free from the sources of error; the title to homage from Gods and men; and the conquest of passions and infirmities. These conceptions crystallised in such terms as *Kevali*, *Arhat* and *Jina*.

After the 6th century there was an emphasis on Ethics in preference to ritualism. Buddhism, Jainism, and Hinduism alike advocated the ascent of man by progressive purification of thought, word and deed. The teachers or *gurus* were many and some of them taught myriads of pupils spread far and wide. Some of them were system-makers, founding schools of knowledge lasting through the ages. Vardhamāna Mahāvīra was the 24th of such system builders in Jainism. Gautama Buddha was preceded by Adi Buddhas whose number is variously given as three, six, or twenty-four. With the immediate predecessors of the Buddha and Mahāvīra we march into the dawn of proto-history. Śri Krishṇa was the 9th Avatāra and the teacher of the *Gita*, a gospel for all ages. The point to note is that sporadic and fitful appearances of the divine are not held satisfactory or sufficient; the chasing of the gloom of ignorance is a steady and continuous process and demands the emergence of a series of *gurus*. Each comes to give point to an ideal; Mahavīra for instance, that of Brahmacharya (chastity and continence) which has been neglected on account of the emphasis laid by his predecessor Pārsvanāth on the other elements of psycho-ethic life. The doctrine of descent of God gives place to that of ascent of man deified and worshipped.

IV

This is clear from the idea of the Bodhisatvas as distinguished from the *Arhat* in Buddhism. The latter is frigid and self-centred; the former is filled with *maitri* and desire to help others; he works not alone for spiritual self-evolution but for the uplift of God's creatures. According to the scriptures of the Mahāyāna the number of Bodhisatvas is

legion—thousands, crores, and in one text 81 lakhs of millions of crores. One text has it that Buddhas are numberless as 'sands on the river Ganges'. Each has his *kshetra* or territory, the spirituality of which he ripens. The duration of life of a Bodhisatva is unlimited and immeasurable. His is a condition of ultra-mundane bliss (*Lokottara*). He lives and moves like the common herd only for the sake of human service and uplift.

The common man finds Buddhahood a distant and doubtful goal. He shrinks from the measureless immensity and unapproachable sublimity of the Universal Spirit. He feels the need for intercessors. (Hence the approval of the worship of the saints even by Sunni Islamites after the 12th century). But faith in them was essential and we find the word *Bhakti* used in the *Thera Gātha*. The Bodhisatva doctrine offers lip homage to Wisdom, but exalts love, and activity, and offers forgiveness of sins confessed. The place of Wisdom glorified by Nagarjuna in the 1st century is gradually taken by mercy (*Karuṇā*) and the triumph is complete by the 9th century. Altruism is regarded as an end in itself, instead of as a means to attain Bodhi. Avalōkitesvara the deity of the compassionate glances, can even abrogate the law of *Karma*. The apotheosis culminates in identifying him with the Universal Spirit, with a lakh of arms and millions of eyes.

The Bodhisatva ideal is that of saving 'all creatures' even at the cost of one's own salvation and supreme bliss. It was a protest against the aloofness and lack of altruism of the *Arhats* who had been saintly and serene but lacked spiritual fervour. The *Pratyeka Buddhās* were enlightened, but carried their illumination to the grave without proclaiming the truth to the world. The earliest records of the Buddha's first sermons do not mention *Nirvāṇa* which was something negative, a cessation of sorrow by the conquest of the intoxicants (*Āsravas*). The Bodhisatva scorned such a *Nirvāṇa* where the liberated was lost to the world as a helper. He regarded it as a sort of negative neo-egoism. His position was that of a descended god who had to clip his wings, so that his pace may be slow enough to permit of those, who bring up the rear, to join him in the endless quest and the eternal race. The highest ideal of the Tirthankaras, the Bodhisatvas and Avatāras alike was to speed up the spiritual life of all beings. The son of God becomes the son of Man the moment he realises his duties to his fellowmen.

V

Buddhist thinkers are loud in their denunciation of the doctrine of *Avatāra*. The real body of the Bodhisatvas (*Dharma Kāya*) is cosmic and spiritual, and it is the Absolute and Transcendent Reality, one and indivisible for the entire Universe. All the Bodhisatvas are spiritually united in the *Dharma Kāya* whose

essence is cosmic law or Wisdom or merely Existence (*prajnā*, *svabhāva*, *Tathatā*). But the physical body of each (*Rūpa Kāya*) is illusory and unreal like the shapes created by the magician *nirmāṇa*. This illusion is the outcome of the Bodhisatvas' wisdom in the choice of methods to convert his hearers (*upāya kauśalya*) ; for the Bodhisatva was an active altruist and extrovert, too full of the milk of human kindness to permit himself to live in solitary grandeur.

All this, however, is the very soul and spirit of the Avatāra doctrine. The various forms of the goddess (*Śakti*) in the *Sapta Satī* become one and indivisible before the overthrow of Śumbhāsura, though their various corporeal manifestations were necessary for the extirpation of the smaller denizens of the nether world. In the *Bhagavad-Gita* Śri Krishna makes it clear that His real form is infinite (*Viśvarūpa*), and that all concrete forms are but pale reflections of some aspect or other in varying media. *Māya* fetters action by attachment to results, and those whose spirit is unselfish get beyond the differentials caused by *Māyā*, and grasp the integral of all in the bosom of the Lord. "Know *Maya* to be the *Prakriti* and *Mayin* or lord of *Maya* to be *Iswara*" is an old Indian adage.

The parallelism with Hinduism was complete when the Bodhisatva was given also a *Sambhôga kāya* or celestial body like the Hindu Devas. The stage of spiritualisation and unification had led to that of deification, and Bodhisatvas were invented as Buddhist counter-parts of Hindu Deities and their incarnations. Sometimes, it is true, each Bodhisatva is merely a virtue of the Buddha personified, as Manjuśrī is of Wisdom ; Avalōkitesvara of Mercy; and Maitreya of Friendliness and Love. One is reminded of the Amesh Spentas of Zoroastrianism which are personifications of Cosmic Law, good thought, piety, wholeness, dominion and immortality. But sometimes we do find that titles of Hindu *devas* are presonified. The best instances in point are Vajrapani and Kshitigarbha. The *Saddharma Pundarika* applies to the Bodhisatvas, epithets similar to those we find applied to Śri Krishṇa in the *Bhagavad Gita*.

The stories of Avalōkitesvara in the *Saddharma Pundarika* are parallel to those of Vishṇu in the *Vishṇu* and *Bhāgavata Purāṇas*. The description of the land of bliss in the Sukhāvati Vyūha and of the saviours Amitābha and Manjuśrī and the visit of the Buddha to Rāvaṇa in Lanka described in the *Lankāvatāra* are reminiscent of Hindu influences. Ratnasambhava and Amogha-Siddhi have the *Abhaya* and *Varada* pose in Mahāyāna iconography as in Vaishnava images. The thousand Buddhas in the grottoes of Serindia correspond to the thousand names of Vishnu and Siva. Most interesting is the neonirvāṇa of the *Suvarnaprabhā Sūtra* (*Na Buddhah parinirvāti na Dharmah parihīyate*). The smile of Shri Krishna is characteristic both in the *Gita* and the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. So is the smile of the Buddha in the Avadāna stories, and from his smile issue rays of blue, yellow, red and white.

VI

The main danger in social service is that, when self-conscious, it begets in the server a sense of egoism or even superciliousness. The Upaniṣads, therefore, remind us, that even self-sacrifice is due to a certain aim at self-satisfaction. "It is not for the sake of your son that you hold him dear, but in order to please yourself." Very often in life the pleasure we get in pleasing others is greater than the sacrifice involved in the act. The *Gita* substitutes for this philosophy that of a disinterested discharge of duty, a homage to the Cosmic Power which designed the sphere of one's duties in the social order. If each does the duty pertaining to his rank and station there is perfection for self as well as stability and progress in society. But the sanction of this abstract principle was found insufficient in the warm life of the work-a-day world. So in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* Love is introduced as the moving force. It is the mark of true Love that she gives without thought of return. She gives her all, because she must, and is unaware even of the extent or purpose of the gift. The love of mother to her child is that of the *gopis* to Krishna in the Purāṇa, of man to his sweetheart in the *Gīta-govinda*. It denies nothing and is not conscious of its self-denial.

S. V. VENKATESWARA

Prolegomena to a New Metaphysic. By THOMAS WHITTAKER. (Cambridge University Press. 5*s*.)

The distinction of earning an exalted reputation with a small output, ascribed by a famous judgment to Collins among the poets, belongs as by right to Mr. Whittaker among the philosophers; and his latest work, in its brevity and depth, may be taken analogically as the abstract and brief chronicle of his lifework. It contains three chapters only : two of moderate length which treat respectively of the refutation of Pragmatism and of the constructive aspect of Mr. Whittaker's philosophy being connected by a short defence of ontology; and the only supplementation of this material takes the form of an excursus justifying the view, adopted in the text, of the unity of Plato's thought as against the rival theory based on the evidence of the disputed Platonic letters. Yet within this short compass Mr. Whittaker gives us all and more than all that his title promises, for if, as he explicitly admits, the metaphysical viewpoint at which he arrives is not so much a new creation as a new syncretism, whatever deductions are due on this account are amply balanced by the fact that they are essentially more than mere "Prolegomena". Yet the term has an august history—as the use made of it by Kant and by T. H. Green may bear witness—and its employment is not inappropriate to a presentation which gives us the categorical and schematic framework of a new vista rather than the rotundity of an elaborate panlogism.

There are early evidences to shew that Mr. Whittaker has found the mere

task of asserting the rights of theoretic truth against pragmatism to be too much of a skiomachy for his taste. His foe is veiled not so much in the mist that saved Aeneas in the *Iliad* as by the Protean nature of his multiple personality; and after bearing in mind that there are said to be thirteen extant varieties of Pragmatism one need not be surprised to find that Mr. Whittaker relinquishes the game of "hunt the pragmatist" as too tiring, especially as he is kind enough to give Protagoras himself the benefit of the doubt and to interpret his doctrine in the terms of the eponymous dialogue rather than in those of the *Theaetetus*. The argument of the first chapter thus soon passes into the positive mode, and finds its issue in the contention that with the Aristotelian logic (at the lowest estimate the foundation of all subsequent developments in that discipline), with the Kantian solution of the Platonic problem of the metaphysical status of mathematical truth, and with the work of Bacon and Mill on the philosophical presuppositions of science, ontology, or at any rate pre-ontology, has set up three landmarks more lasting than brass. It is at this point that Mr. Whittaker claims that the new attitude adopted by philosophical men of science, that "confirmation of modern idealistic criticism from a process within physical science itself" which suggests that the primordial entities towards which science is feeling its way are purely symbolic in the sense that they offer themselves as no correlates of human sense-functions, may mark a definite parting of the ways. Speculative philosophy, it is hinted, may of course refuse to venture further upon uncharted seas; but if she does so, she falters at a moment when the powers that flouted her are almost persuaded to seek her aid, and that is hardly a moment for that policy of "coercendi intra terminos imperii" which recommended itself to Kant. This is one of the most convincing statements of the philosophical import of the present cosmological situation that has yet been formulated; and it is all the more impressive because its sponsor declines to take a rash step further forward and to subscribe to the too facile suggestion that the possible indeterminacy of the physical unit of mass may constitute a sound philosophical argument in favour of the hypothesis of man's free-will.

The parenthetic chapter with which Mr. Whittaker connects this position with his own suggested basis for further speculation forms an important step in the argument in that it envisages the argument against the renewal of the search for reality no longer on the biological or pragmatic level but on the deeper ground of the element of agnoiology in the great ontologists from Plato onwards; and it reaches forward to the subject dealt with in the last chapter by means of the suggestion that the "Idea of the Good" is to be interpreted as the abstract teleological form of the concrete interactions within the "realm of ends" which Plato called the *dialektikē eidôn*. This passage deserves to be placed beside Professor Whitehead's conception of the Platonic ideas as "eternal objects" which become "ingredient into" phenomena, not merely as representing the ontological aspect of Whitehead's cosmology, but also as harmonising with it into a dual representation of the power of Platonism to renew its meaning and its imagery "deep in the universal heart of man". Starting from an adumbration of the problem of the One and the Many, which doubtless retains its dual Platonic rôle of the fascinating morsel of the neophyte and of the serious concern of the loftiest minds, Mr. Whittaker eschews all attempts to consider the question of the primal procession of the Many and focuses attention upon the question of the metaphysical status of multiplicity as such. Arguing that the discernible form of teleology must be supposed to enter with the advent of the organism, he maintains that the "teleological idea" begins at this point perceptibly to "determine the direction of a motion otherwise ambiguous" and that this idea itself is "part of a pre-existent Many". This "pre-existent Many" is viewed as

metaphysical plurality from which the physical universe of "things" and "individuals" forms as it were a selection; but Mr. Whittaker is sufficiently indifferent to the charge of taking up too anthropomorphic a standpoint to suggest that it is at least possible that "the world of organic life may be a directed phase of a process destined to prepare for human thought, by which at length all past causes . . . . . are grasped". The final stages of the argument, wherein it is demonstrated that teleology does not imply regressionless advance, that pessimism has been strangely prolific of theodicies, and that the triple end of the teleological process may be viewed under the scheme of the Kantian triad of Truth, Goodness and Beauty, are admirably developed: and in the end we have the suggestion that a combination of the intuitions of Leibniz, Proclus, and Bergson may lead us back—or forward—to the vision of Plotinus and to a new interpretation of the destiny of unitary personality as a "monad" endued with "aseitas," to enjoy immortality in the triadic form of teleological idea, rational thought, and memory in its suprasensuous manifestation.

It is possible that Mr. Whittaker, who has very completely shewn that "questions of the future of mind or minds are not capable of any facile solution," and who moreover has amply made good his defence of his dialectical transition from "organism" to "individual," has not been quite so successful in giving internal harmony to all the components in his provisional synthesis. It is not, for instance, quite easy to reconcile the boldness of the anthropocentric standpoint with the less assured intimation that "One manifestation of the pre-existent Many is in the lives of animals, culminating in human life". Nor are we wholly satisfied by the comforting thought that we need not fear to be anthropocentric because we can say either that the Creator finds Creation so easy or that "tantae molis erat"—"mortalia condere sarda," as Mr. Whittaker might have finished his hexameter. The first is the explanation of Spinoza—"non defuit ei materia ad omnia ab infimo usque ad summum perfectionis gradum creanda"—and it is as inadequate ethically as the latter is metaphysically. Again, whatever the merits of the gentle contention between Mr. Whittaker and Dr. Inge as to the shade, if any, of determinism discoverable in Plotinus, it is not easy to endorse Mr. Whittaker's commendation of Hume's image of the prisoner who prefers to try to break prison rather than to bribe a stern gaoler, since the point really proved is not so much that "we are more firmly convinced of necessity in proportion as we understand it from within" as that it is better policy to work on materials which apparently must yield to adequate treatment than on a will which, being free or seemingly free, may remain finally intractable. The case against determinism however sits even more loosely to Mr. Whittaker's main thesis than does the defence of the integrity of Platonism, and should only be judged as more or less of a parergon. He has shewn by the erudition and ingenuity of his main line of thought that the present crucial time for philosophy seems fraught with a clear mandate for intrepid advance, and he has presented a strong case for a modified Leibnizianism from which the elements of parallelism and sectarian theodicy have been refined away. He has moreover suggested that it is in the direction of speculative elaboration of the conception of palingenesis, itself never far from the deepest thought of either Plato or Leibniz, that the main line of advance must move. His explanation of the status of human mind in the present world-process in relation to the "pre-existent Many" and its unlimited evolutionary actualisation is at times not easy to follow: but he has brilliantly demonstrated the truth that a de-spiritualised metaphysic, already deeply wounded in the house of its friends, is ripe for overthrow before a spiritual idealism which dares to seize and face its opportunity unflinchingly.

CRATYLUS

Heredity, in the light of Esoteric Philosophy. By IRENE BASTOW HUDSON, M. B., M.B.B.S., L.M.C., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P. (Rider & Co., London. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

The author is evidently a serious student of *The Secret Doctrine*, (including the so-called 3rd volume) and other Theosophical works, and her book is an attempt to present to the public a sketch of the genesis of man on this earth as given out by H. P. Blavatsky and her Eastern Teachers. Its aim is to awaken its readers to an appreciation of man's Spiritual nature, and to invite modern science to a study of the philosophy of the Ancient East. The present day morality is strongly condemned, and the writer makes an earnest appeal for greater purity of life and the abolition of such prevalent evils as birth-control, injections into the blood stream, etc. To students of Theosophy this little book will be most interesting, as it outlines the teachings of *The Secret Doctrine* dealing briefly with rounds and races, the sin of the mindless, reincarnation and karma, etc. One wishes for a more convincing and systematized presentation of the wealth of material given out mostly by means of quotations (sometimes without the quotation marks). To the average reader most of these will be incomprehensible, and he may refuse the ethical instruction with which they are intermixed on the ground that he doesn't know what it is all about: Whether it will succeed in arresting the attention of the non-Theosophical reader, and especially of the man of science, is doubtful. Yet the book contains valuable information and is a noble effort to popularize the doctrines of Theosophy. And so we cannot but hope with its author that the current of thought it sends out into the world may indeed awaken other similar currents, thus making its contribution to the changing of the mind of the Race.

S. B.

Caste and Race in India. By G. S. GHURYE, Ph. D. (Cantab). (Kegan Paul, London. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The subject is one of absorbing interest not only to students of anthropology, and sociology, but also to politicians and social reformers, who will find enlightenment in this study. For the most part our knowledge of the subject was so long derived from the writings of Western researchers but even after their best efforts room was left for native scholars to come forward and bring to bear upon it their knowledge of facts from within. Dr. Ghurye, who has a mastery of the principles of anthropology with a knowledge of the modern theories of caste, and a thorough acquaintance with the facts to be found in Indian literature, is specially competent for the task.

The institution of caste, the author holds, is no special Hindu peculiarity: it is one of the remarkable developments in the history of sociology at large. "Social differentiation with its attendant demarcation of groups and of status of individuals is a very widespread feature of human society." In greater number of communities the status is dependent on the individuals' achievement in the fields of activity prized by the communities, while in others it is determined by birth. The theory of status by birth, while holding true of other peoples of the Indo-European group, has been carried by the Hindus to its utmost limit, and the uniqueness of the Hindu system lies in its classification of some groups as untouchable and unapproachable. The history of the Hindu institution of caste forms an interesting study. The author passes in review through the ages, from the early Vedic period to the present time, to show how the social philosophy of caste ruled in the past and has been affected by the modern ideas of rights and duties. In any case, he considers it an unadulterated evil. Whatever had been the state of affairs in the past, the advent of the British as the political head of society might have greatly improved the position, but to consolidate their power over a strange land and people they thought it more prudent to leave the system severely alone. Instead of making the caste-spirit innocuous they have rather nursed it. This has mainly stood in the way of the formation of an Indian nationhood. Nevertheless, the rigidity of the practice of caste has relaxed. To-day a section of the Hindus—the modernly educated persons—has revolted on their own against the old restrictions, and the most advanced of these, the author included, would do away with the system *in toto* on account of its baneful results on the nation. The book is well written and should appeal to a wide circle of readers, and especially to those in the West, who are eager to understand the problem of modern India in some of its varied aspects. One of the reforms suggested by the author is the starting of theological seminaries for training Hindu priests who will break the monopoly of the Brahmanas; but *what* will they be taught?

J. K. M.

The Extension of Consciousness. By C. W. OLLIVER B. A., B. Sc., E. S. E. (Rider & Co., London. 15*s.*)

This is emphatically a book to recommend to all who view mysticism, as it should be viewed if it is genuine, from a scientific stand-point. If there is one thing more than another for which the mystics stand, it is an extension of consciousness. They dare to hope, ultimately, for a consciousness extended to be universal. Can this idea appeal, in any rational sense, to the scientific mind? Mr. Olliver, in a balanced and admirable treatise, maintains that it can. He leaves nothing to chance, but in plain language submits the known facts to the cold light of a scientific examination.

His theories, Mr. Olliver says, are only working theories, but he claims recognition for his facts as being beyond dispute. It is a fact, for instance, that all individuals to some extent, and certain of them in greater degree, possess the faculty of extending their awareness to include objects or ideas which are beyond the limits of perception afforded by the five senses. Whether such an extension can be developed or not, "the mere fact that it exists must shake Science and Philosophy to their very foundations, since their scheme of things can admit no assumption of this nature". Mr. Olliver marshals his proofs very ably from experiments with both normal and abnormal subjects, and then discusses telepathy, the foretelling of future events, and spiritualistic phenomena, letting in on these popular topics of the day a much-needed breath of fresh air from his reasoning brain. His explanations are careful re-statements of conclusions that might be expected from one developing his conscious life.

The development of the intuition is a matter of primary importance. What has Mr. Olliver to say about that, in connection with what he calls *cryptaesthesia*, the faculty of extended awareness?

> An individual with a highly developed mentality or intelligence has not the same restricted consciousness as that of the average man. His mind will work along lines which must ever remain mysterious to the majority. They call this intuition. Is genius merely intuition? It is a well-observed fact that all great scientific discoveries are due to intuitive thought and by no means to an "infinite capacity for taking pains"; that comes afterwards. Intuition is an exceedingly curious conception: but a very real one. It is just as mysterious as cryptaesthesia, perhaps even more so. Eddington, unable to deny its importance, considers it as a sort of "side door" through which facts may enter into our consciousness; but in that case, so is cryptaesthesia. Both are akin, inasmuch as they apparently ignore the medium of our ordinary senses. We cannot say that cryptaesthesia is merely intuition, any more than we would be justified in stating that intuition is due to the existence of cryptaesthetic faculties. Both, however, are undeniably real and depend on an extension of our awareness, either through our normal senses, which does not seem very probable, or through some further medium, the existence of which it has been my object to suggest.
>
> R. A. L. ARMSTRONG

Oriental Conference Papers. By SIR JIVANJI JAMSHEDJI MODI. (Pilot Street, Upper Colaba, Bombay.)

This volume represents a collection of ten papers on subjects connected with Parsee culture and literature, read by Sir J. J. Modi, before the various sections of the six Oriental Conferences held up to now in India. Dr. Modi is, in conjunction with the late Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, the originator of these conferences in his native land, which have proved a great success and an incentive for the development of home studies.

It requires a specialist in this field to discuss in detail the profound papers of the author, and since I cannot claim this qualification I must content myself with a few general remarks.

The collection contains four notable essays, *viz.*, one on "Alexander the Great and the Ancient Literature of the Parsees," another on "The Doctrine of Karma from the Zoroastrian point of view," a third on the "Hun Invaders of India" and a fourth on "The Parsee High Priest, D. A. Kaiwan (1529–1614). The last named article gives valuable information about Sufism, with reference to which we have to correct one oversight in so far as he places Rabi's in the first century A. D., whereas it should have been the eighth.

Since the general reader probably knows very little about Parsee customs it may not be out of place to refer here to the very old custom in every Parsee family of keeping two record books, *viz.*, the *Disā-Pothi* (family death register) and the *Nām-grahan* (record of name-taking, , *i. e.*, christening).

Sir J. J. Modi deals with the Disā-pothi in a separate essay. Every family is supposed to have a Disā-pothi, in which the names of the departed ancestors and members of the family and also those of the departed relations by blood or marriage are entered with the dates.

There are three processes, which follow one another, for preparing a Disā-pothi:

(*a*) When a death takes place the priests enter it on a stray slip of paper. They go on doing so for a month.

(*b*) At the end of a month, or, at convenience, at two or three more months, they enter the notes of death into a paper which they call *bandhio.*

(*c*) At the end of the year, or at convenience later on, the names of all the dead during the year are entered into a *vahi* or book called *disā-pothi.*

Sometimes the name of a living person (zindeh ravān) is found in the list of the names of the dead. The following custom among the Parsees explains this: A person, in his life-time, performs for the benefit of his soul all the ceremonies including the funeral ceremony which will have to be performed at his death by his surviving relatives. This is considered a meritorious act for him. When one does so in his life-time, he is believed to feel easy in mind; it will not matter much, if, under any circumstances, his funeral ceremonies are not performed after his death.

Interesting is the mention of the Hamāzor ceremony, (p. 157), in which all participants join hands, thus symbolising the unification of the individual with all others and the attunement to the spiritual Universe, based on the identity of life in all. This is the essence of prayer. Sir J. J. Modi compares this ceremony with the "kiss of peace" among the Jews.

One cannot help feeling impressed with the nobility, truth and spirituality of the Parsee prophets and their writings, to which Dr. Modi's book bears eloquent testimony. And yet many of the ancient Pahlavi books were lost in the conflagration of the Royal Palace of Persepolis to which Alexander the Great set fire himself in a fit of drunkenness at the instigation of a concubine called Thais (p. 108 seq.)

W. STEDE

THE LAND OF PSYCHE AND OF NOUS

[**A. E. Waite** is well-known for his many valuable books—veritable flames of old knowledge which are worth an exchange with more than one modern bulb. Every quarter he will give to our readers, the benefit of his researches and reading of the many periodicals containing matter of interest.—EDS.]

Professor Julian Huxley, discussing the Rudi Schneider experiments in Telekinesis at the Paris International Metapsychical Institute and at the National Laboratory of Psychical Research in London, bears something more than tentative witness to the view that they present "a new mode of interaction between the realm of mind and the realm of matter"; and that if they are confirmed, "they put into the hands of science a key which is destined to unlock a new domain of knowledge".* Professor D. F. Fraser-Harris proclaims in the same connection "a new era in Psychical Research", or at least adopts this title for a general account of the experiments and his reflections thereupon. It is based on his own vigilant experience at the London sittings and on Dr. Osty's report in *Revue Métapsychique*†. It is a new era in more than one sense. Professor Fraser-Harris is "convinced that fraud did not play any part in the London sittings,"* while Mr. Theodore Besterman, another witness, speaking of those in Paris, affirms that "fraud in the ordinary sense may be ruled out".‡ Dr. Osty's report must be read, however, at first hand by those who would be assured personally. He devised "an arrangement of infra-red rays," whereby any interruption "could not only be signalled by the ringing of an electric bell but photographed by the oscillations of the spot of red light actuated by a very sensitive galvanometer". It is added that in this manner "the personal equation was eliminated". Here is the first point, and the second is that Rudi Schneider's phenomena of Telekinesis, or movement of objects at a distance of five or six feet from where he is seated, are yet the seeming result of strenuous muscular effort on his part: witness (1) his forced and rapid breathing, (2) clenched hands, (3) bodily contortions, (4) groans and moans. It seems difficult to exaggerate the importance of this discovery, taken in connection with the fact that a "state of trance or particular modification of Rudi's psychism 'is' a causal *sine qua non* for the subsequent exhibition of the telekinstic happenings". Rudi out of trance can no more levitate distant objects than the least psychic of his sitters. One is led to speculate whether the Osty arrangement of infra-red rays will be brought to bear by Dr. Crandon on the phenomena

* See LIGHT, Sept. 23, 1932.
† See No. 6 of 1931 and Nos. 1 & 2 of 1932.
‡ PROCEEDINGS of the Society for Psychical Research, June, 1932.

produced in the presence of his gifted and famous wife, Margery, who is perhaps even a more powerful psychical medium than Rudi himself—certainly more diversified.

While the exploration of the Land of Psyche is advancing with such strides and absorbing public attention in ways too many to enumerate, the World of the Mystics—which for some of us is the Land of Nous—becomes almost from month to month a more living interest. It is exhibited at their value by new associations but more especially by the continuous appearance of authentic books and articles in literary reviews. New voices are being heard and familiar personalities are still here to testify. Mr. Edmond Holmes is an old name among us, and many will have been drawn recently to his monograph on the *Headquarters of Reality*, in part because of its subject but in part because of Mr. Holmes as an expositor thereof. He has unfolded in many essays and in more than one book the Doctrine of the Unity. For some of us who have taken into our hearts the old Zoharic maxim that in the last resource there is no distinction between Shekinah and the Holy One, and who know its connotations, will be ever his willing audience. He lays down in his last words that " he who has *lived* his way—the way of self-loss and self-transcendence—into the heart of Reality is ' the master of those who know' ".* But Mr. Holmes is aware also that in self-transcendence and so only do we find the Self of Reality. And this is the finding of God. The key, however, of such findings is that here is the one quest wherein that which we propose to attain is that which in truth we are. At a first glance therefore it would seem not alone a simple quest but one wherein the seeker might scarcely err or fail. That which interposes to bar the way is unfortunately another self, one of the " correlated opposites" contrasted by Mr. Holmes, otherwise the false self, over against " the One, the All" which abides in each, "in the unity of its totality, as his Real Self." From this point of view, the work of self-transcendence is operated on the false self. As regards the path of attainment, it is for Mr. Holmes, as for all the witnesses, a path of love, a path of sacrifice, a path of contemplation on that which abides within us while in respect of the attainment itself all Western Mystics have exhausted language and not found the word for that "Incommunicable secret". They have stood " perforce silent in its presence". But it calls to be affirmed (1) that the sacrifice is of that and all that which does not belong to Reality; (2) that the contemplation object is the eternal subject within us; and (3) that the only efficacious love which can be poured out upon others flows from the inward centre of our being. As the present writer has indicated elsewhere, and on many occasions, it is above all

*. The Hibbert Journal, Oct. 1932, pp. 129-140.

things love without the body of desire—not because this is beyond redemption, but its redemption is of another order, and for those who accept Reincarnation would connect with Karmic Law. There is one thing more: the finding of God will never be fulfilled without until it has been achieved within.

The name of Abelard is with us still in these days of ours. A new edition of certain immortal Letters may bring it back to us vividly, or a study in a literary journal. The most recent of all is a graphic picture by Miss Barclay Carter which seems true to the spirit and the life from what we know of the records. One of his memorable lines—*Cum erit omnia Deus in omnibus*—may be the flash of a moment and even suggest deeper things to those who read—or a few of them—than it did to him who wrote the Canticle from which the words are drawn—to him, brilliant controversialist the Master, about whom a school of disciples would gather, as if in a moment, wheresoever he found himself. What days have passed since he, in his "all-daring rationalism", as Miss Carter puts it, felt able to affirm and maintain that "nothing should be believed which is not understood". What lists he rode in, in what tilts he scored, till after many Calvaries, the day came and its morrow when he saw St. Bernard and all the Bishops arrayed at the Council of Sens, *anno* 1140; when he saw in their faces that he was condemned ere they heard him; when he stilled an eager tongue and transferred the appeal to Rome; when Rome ratified Sens and all its findings; when he fled to Cluny and—figuratively or perhaps literally—died in the arms of loving kindness which were those of Peter the Venerable. What days have passed, what farings in ways of change. Will Rome ever dare now to summon a Vatican Council and complete the work unfinished in 1870? More cruel question still, would it matter if Rome did? Great though it be in its history, great once in political power, the story of the Church seems that of the world ill lost and God not gained, except by individual souls. And Abelard in his thesis was once and one great time wrong, yet ten times over right. When at an earlier period he took refuge in the wilderness of " desolate plains" and found therein some breath of the Spirit of God, some grace of Divine Comfort which seemed to him that of the Paraclete, who thinks to-day, amidst his sorrows and his prayers, that in deep wells of thought he did not feel the presence of that "Something not ourselves" in which we must believe, though it baffles for ever the merely logical mind? So was he wrong, once only and one great time, but over and over right. How fares it now with that which, being beyond understanding, is imposed on the authority of others? Who shall attempt it now? And as to past Church Doctrine, how lightly is

that passed over, how theology as such drops out, how well is it taken for granted in communions that make for progress, that we may keep on the side of exhortation and not on the rack of debate. Rome is always excepted, where the Mass matters indeed, but the preaching little enough, at least in most cases. Meanwhile Miss Carter closes concerning Abelard with an eloquent reminder, namely, that "nineteen Cardinals, over fifty Bishops and Archbishops, and two Popes had been his students". This notwithstanding some among us will be open to realise that his chief title to remembrance, after all the wrangling, is not that which remains of his writings, is not his love for Heloise, but her great of all great loves for him.*

There are still those who may love Bishop Berkeley for his once *New Theory of Vision* and yet more in spite of it, because they love *Alciphron* and *Siris* perhaps above all, an immortal tract concerning the virtues of Tar-Water and divers matters therewith connected or arising thereform. The whole cosmos arises and a world of high *Theosophia*. These cannot fail to be intrigued when they hear about Berkeley's Library, the Catalogue of which was printed by Leigh and Sotheby in 1796, when the books were put up for sale. It came into possession of the British Museum and was interred, so to speak, in the Newspaper Room, but had no place in the Reading Room Catalogue until 1912. The Sotheby pamphlet of 46 pp. includes also the Libraries of Berkeley's son, grandson and a kinsman, making some 1600 items in all, of which 1100 are referred to the Bishop of Cloyne as owner. It remained unknown to all intents and purposes till it was discovered in 1929 by Mr. René Maheu, who wrote about it in a *Revue d'Hist. de la Philosophie*. There is of course no need or opportunity to speak of the bibliographical content here; but one item may be noted with curious interest—No. 167 in the List, being Jacob Böhme's *Aurora Day* or *Spring*, published in 1712.† One must read *Siris* again in the light of Berkeley's possession of this volume, whether or not it may be difficult to believe that the idealist of the early 18th Century owed anything to the Teutonic Philosopher. Assuredly the Irish Prelate dwelt in the Land of Nous and Böhme assuredly in a world of vision, strangely ordered and strangely unfolded before him. For himself and for many who have lived in his light, it has been a world of authentic revelation, and his work has been held to be that of one who had seen into the heart of things. It continues to exercise an influence among an increasing few, and the fact has justified the publication of most of his volumes in new and admirable editions.‡ No one can offer judgment concerning him in a few words; but essentially speaking his revelation belongs to the Land of Psyche; yet is it somewhere on the border line giving entrance to the Land of Nous. Apart from what must be called his system, the works of Böhme are full of deep insight and shadow forth, after their own manner, many luminous reflections from the World of Reality.

A. E. WAITE

* The Contemporary Revue, Sept., 1932

† See MIND, Oct., 1932.

‡ The reference is to those which have been issued by Mr. J. M. Watkins, and they include the *Mysterium Magnum*.

CORRESPONDENCE

SEARCH FOR SOUL

The *Journal of Transactions* of the Society for Promoting the Study of Religions issued in June, 1932, contains reports of lectures delivered on "Greek and Roman Ideas of the Soul" covering the subject-matter progressively from the period of Early Greeks to that of the Neo-Platonists. We feel bound therefore to point out that the philosophical search for Soul is contemporaneous with the dawn of reflection. This concept which is looked upon with suspicion because it refuses to be squeezed into the straight-jacket of scientific experimentation under laboratory control is the basis of religion and philosophy. While the laboratory disciplinarians like Sir Arthur Keith are maintaining that humanity survives only in posterity, there persists a respectable body of opinion believing in immortality of the soul. There is no need to recapitulate the interesting account of the search for Soul undertaken by the ancient Greeks and Romans, embodied in the *Journal of Transactions* but a very significant step in comparative study will have been taken if the quintessentials of Indian quest after Soul are mentioned.

Without needless circumlocution or equivocation, we may as well directly state that the existence of a spiritual entity (call it by whatever name you please, spirit, soul, self, consciousness, etc.) encased in a nervous mechanism is a factual and methodological postulate of Indian thought. The Rig-Vedic hymns, the Upanishadic texts, the Epics, the Six Systems of philosophy, Jainism, and Buddhism have postulated the existence of soul. The Monistic systems like the Advaita of Sankaracharya emphasize the existence of One Soul, and the Dualistic and Pluralistic systems like those of Madhvacharya maintain the existence of a plurality of souls.

Philosophy, Oriental or Occidental, must take its stand on the solid bedrock of the consolidated rational experience of humanity. Life is full of inequalities, in the matter of ability, equipment, and endowment of individuals and communities. The observed inequality needs a rational explanation. There is no inconsistency in an endeavour logically to prove the existence of Soul postulated methodologically. The Sankhya system makes a fine attempt (*Purushosti-bhoktribhavat-kaivalyartham-pravrittescha . . .*) at such a proof. The endeavour for a progressive perfection is evidence which proves the existence of some spiritual entity which cannot be reduced to a mere bio-chemical conglomeration of bone, muscle, nerves and tendon.

Taking the present world-order as the only point of departure, the observed inequality, the existence of sin and evil, of anti-social conduct, and similar phenomena will have to be understood as effects of past actions containing potentialities of future existences. If the inevitable retrospective reference of the present to the past, and its equally inevitable prospective and anticipatory reference to the future, be admitted, we

stand face to face with the doctrine of Karma. We are what we are as a result of actions done in an earlier existence. We have before us the exalted, spiritual destiny of Regaining Paradise which has been now lost. The timelessness of the Soul and its survival after bodily death, are intimately linked up with the doctrine of Karma. There is no mystery or illogicality about the doctrine. Notwithstanding loud protests emanating from certain quarters, the Law of Causation still governs all scientific endeavour and evaluation. Lift the Law of Causation from the physical to the spiritual and moral realms. You have immediately the Law of Karma.

Pure intelligence, and pure bliss are the characteristics of the Soul. The intelligence now revealed by mankind stands nonetheless beclouded for the conquests over Nature effected by it, in respect of its own fundamental nature and its relation to the Supreme Power. Nor is the hedonistically determined pleasure enjoyed by mankind entitled to be described as bliss.

All systems of philosophy agree in holding that the envelopment of the mind and intellect of mankind by foundational or fontal folly or ignorance (*Ajnyanavrita buddhi manas etc.*) is responsible for the ills that head and heart are heirs to. The riddance of that fontal folly has to be secured through the instrumentality of spiritual practices rigorously pursued. Freedom from race-pride, and other prides and dedication of one's gifts and opportunities to service of humanity which is the most exalted worship of the Supreme Lord, are counselled by all systems of philosophy prevalent in India. After all, the most powerful argument urged by the Indian systems of thought in support of the existence of Soul and of its survival after dissolution of the nervous mechanism, is the utter inadequacy and unsatisfyingness of the present world-order, brought to its present state of evolution by man's own intelligence and the Creative Evolutionary Power or Agency by whatever name designated. The nervous assemblage of bio-chemical elements of bodies such as they are cannot remain intact for an indefinite span of time. Life as known to science contains within it germs of death and destruction. If the present world-order be claimed to be final, many of the inequalities, contradictions, repudiations of moral values, and similar phenomena become inexplicable. The Indian doctrine of Karma by referring retrospectively to the past and prospectively to the future, attempts to explain them as the outcome of the former which would contain certain potentialities for the latter. As, obviously, the neuro-muscular mechanism cannot enjoy unlimited existence in future, and as it could not have existed in the past in its present state, the transmigratory career will fall to the lot of some spiritual non-material entity which is described to be the Soul or Spirit.

A minority view has always denied the existence of the Soul or Souls. The early Greek thinkers endeavoured to explain the world-order as determined by the cosmic constituents of Water, Fire, etc. The Indian Charvaka vehemently repudiates the existence of any spiritual entity.

Notwithstanding the minority view which strongly savours of an abnormality and an urge to libertine life, the thinking section of humanity has regulated and modelled its conduct firmly believing in the existence of souls. The value and validity of a philosophical doctrine must in the last analysis depend not on mere logical consistency or fool-proof system building, but, on spiritual satisfyingness and on opportunities for progress and perfection, love and sacrifice, it would afford. The Atom has been split. The conquest of air and ether is celebrated all the world over. Yet, hatred, jealousy, exploitation, crime, are rampant as ever. The fight between Ahriman and Ormuzd has not yet ended.

When confronted with the present-world-order with its dangerous devotion to hideous forms of hedonism, rational behaviour has to be modelled on the

firm belief in Soul and its exalted spiritual destiny, which can be realised only by the Grace of the Supreme Lord after sacrifice and suffering. All Religions when viewed dispassionately will be understood to be centripetally drawn to a doctrine like that. Metaphysics is just rational investigation of the nature of the finite self and the Supreme Power. Religion is just the attitude of the finite to the Infinite. There is no doubt that any society founded with the purpose of awakening the religious faculties in men and women should be deemed as doing an immense service, and we may be allowed to suggest that the founding of an active Society in India for the promotion of scientific study of Religions is indispensable. India's present politically formative period may accelerate Religious Revival as well.

R. NAGA RAJA SARMA

Kumbhakonam

VESSELS OF WISDOM

It is useful to distinguish between wisdom and knowledge; knowledge admits of some classifications which wisdom does not. Knowledge may be eastern or western but wisdom is universal. Knowledge is measurable by pragmatic standards—it may be valued in a series of its various degrees and kinds of usefulness: A greater knowledge is that which makes life more mechanized, or that which results in a higher efficiency and ease on the sensuous level, or that which increases biologic and bodily strength of the human being. Wisdom, however, could not be adjusted to, or arranged in a series of graded values. Self-completeness is the distinctive mark of Wisdom. Outer expressions of Wisdom, though they may far surpass in worth those of knowledge, are really unessential, and do not help in evaluating the depth and nature of Wisdom. Knowledge is partial acquaintance with the nature of life in the objective world. Wisdom is an integrated experience, a self-organized whole.

In ancient east there did not exist a category of knowledge distinct from wisdom. The inward outlook with which the ancient Seers studied their world-experience hastened them through the merely objective stages of evolution, and when they paused to pronounce their judgment upon experience, the physical phenomena had already lost their value and significance. Modern western thinkers have been too absorbed in the exterior and though they do betray a somewhat unconscious gravitation towards a different order of values their characteristic attitude must be reckoned as dealing with only the outside of phenomena.

Wisdom is not without its own evolution and history. It is only the culmination of a process. The peculiar aspect of this process is that it is not *definite* in the mechanical and arbitrary sense of the term, though in spiritual sense that process is *exactness* itself, is *definite* beyond a possibility of variation. One important result flows from the absence of this mechanical definiteness: Knowledge, as indeed every kind of experience, can be utilized as an avenue for Wisdom. All depends on the method of integration. Although the monadic quality of human beings inheres in the fact that all experience is an integrating process, yet, what becomes at once the peculiar privilege and distinctive responsibility of Man is to rationalize that integration, to illuminate

---

* *Shrimad-Bhagavad-Gitanka* (Hindi) Edited by Babu Raghavadas Hanumana Prasada Poddar (Ghanashyamadasa, Gita Press, Gorakhpur. Rs. 2 8 as.)

Another special issue of *Kalyan* entitled " *Ishwaranka* " has come to hand as the present review is about to be concluded. It deals with the Problem of Deity as its Sanskrit title indicates, and is a collection of revealing and significant contributions. India has begun shedding its cobwebs of blind superstition as is clearly proven by the contributors to this volume, among whom are, it is gratifytng to note, two Shankaracharyas heads of holy honoured seats of the old world. The number opens with a selection of prayers from the Vedic, Buddhistic, Jain, Muhammadan and Christian scriptures indicating the spirit of universal Brotherhood which is moulding India of to-day.

that somewhat blind tendency in nature, to evolve and unfold it really, in the sunlight of self-awareness. In the radiance of growing self-awareness every kind of experience becomes a lesson in Wisdom, but outside that radiance howsoever rich and varied an experience it must eventually stultify itself. The progress of western knowledge is a sorry instance in point. As Geoffrey West points out in THE ARYAN PATH for February last (p. 129) "something seems radically wrong " with the West which is obviously incapable of using its vast knowledge "for concerted human good ". This barren corpulence of western knowledge could be transformed into healthy, spiritual muscle if it is exercised on the uphill way towards the discovery of self-awareness. As an experience western knowledge is an integrating process. To build that process into a *conscious* vision, to reach fromout that knowledge to the star-heights of Wisdom which is Self-awareness, seems to be the next step, and though a most difficult one, by no means impossible. The West must look for it, and take it. But one can easily see that the fresh horizon has already burst on the western mind. Indeed in point of spiritual perception some western minds —for example that of Mr. Fausset's or of Mr. Beresford's—can put to shame not a few modern thinkers of the east.

Most thinkers in ancient days had, of necessity, only a small measure of knowledge in the modern sense. The very lack of opportunity for gathering information had proved a positive asset; the ancients grew more in Wisdom because there was less of deviation and dissipation of forces. Even in modern times, this concentration of the ancients has been possible for those who gravitate by force of their innate nature towards the attainment of self-awareness and self-rationalization. In India we do meet with persons, way away in the country, who are grown and matured in Wisdom; comparatively they are much superior to those who live in modernized cities. As a result of growing connections between city- and country-life, concentration of vision is becoming more and more difficult of achievement. Knowledge similar to the western kind and altogether different from Wisdom has been thriving in more than one Asiatic country, and the east of to-day has little of its ancient Wisdom left to guide its vision. The east cannot get at it through its present imitative knowledge-process. If this imitation is pushed with a blind obstinacy to the fatal limit, it will result in a total disintegration of the spiritual forces of what Æ calls "the National Being." Take the Japanese as an example. Do they not show signs of a coming disintegration? The present-day Japan has been westernized to the limit; but, can this achievement give it a lasting vitality or open for it a new avenue for growth? Does it possess the necessary genius for the western type of culture and life? Japan seems to be losing its vitality and viability in the suicidal process of false imitation. Moreover, the west it imitates is itself a bursting bubble.

The nationalism of Japan is held forth in India by not a few as a fine example. A like wave of admiration for Japan is passing through other Asiatic countries. The copy proves more attractive than the original because of its geographical vicinity and cultural affinities. By now the east is deep in love with knowledge in preference to Wisdom; but, fortunately, Wisdom lingers unknown in the unsophisticated mass mind; therefore the east has some strength left to struggle against its own *acquired* tendencies and temptations towards westernization. India is particularly fortunate in this. The attachment to the inner, hidden core of Wisdom is sufficiently strong in the Indian mass mind. Though there does exist a strong pull towards the knowledge-process of the West and towards the nationalism of Japan the present hour seems very appropriate for a new orientation. With vigilance and vision the old heritage can be saved and even enriched.

A nation's soul is its inner Wisdom. This is kept alive and active by that cosmical urge which is working out the grand scheme of the Whole. The vehicles which preserve that soul and Wisdom in every nation are the immortal works of Master Minds. For example the soul of the West is preserved in the works of Pythagoras, Plato, Jesus and others.

In India the Wisdom-soul is treasured in the Vedas, the Upanishads, and most intelligibly and practicably in the *Bhagavad-Gita*. By the light of these great works the present life and situations should be studied and interpreted. In doing this we must not politicalize these sacred possessions and own them in an exclusive spirit. The spiritual redintegration of humanity, the attainment to Self-awareness is possible only through a deep plunge in the waters of ageless and ancient Wisdom as incarnated in Great Works. Such a task of re-orientation in the right spirit does not seem to be an impossibility, and what is more, there are signs and omens.

One such sign is a recent publication in Hindi, the *lingua franca* of India, of a wonderful volume on the *Bhagavad-Gita*, a volume in which we find some potency and promise of the resuscitation of true Indian and Eastern Wisdom. We have about a hundred and fifty articles from the gifted minds in India—and also a few in the west—minds which are struggling to reach down to the precious core of the *Gita* teaching. Of course they are of unequal merit but only a very few are guilty of measuring the *Gita* teachings with the gauge of western knowledge. These articles have been selected with judgment and most of them show a new dawn of ancient thought.

Bombay D. G. V.

INDIA & OBJECTIVE REALITY

In connection with my article on 'India and Objective Reality' which appeared in your issue of October 1932, you were pleased to remark in your introductory note that my article "also has a streak of extremism". I do not accept the correctness of this, but I did not care to correct it, as you are perfectly welcome to have your own views as to what constitutes 'extremism', but when in your issue of November 1932 I find that you regard Mr. Charles Dernier's article on the 'Thrill Psychosis' as a rejoinder to my article, I cannot help thinking that it is time to protest against this sort of misconception. There is nothing in Mr. Dernier's article which bears at all on my article. In fact, I entirely agree with him except perhaps in one or two small details. It is exceedingly reasonable of him not to be obsessed by the importance of his own civilization and that as a reasonable man, he is fully conscious of his duty to point out the evils in his civilization. I only wish that this healthy attitude of mind could as well be adopted by the members of other civilizations including that of India. In my article I made it quite clear that there were defects in the western civilization—and I have pointed this out in several of my articles elsewhere—but in the article contributed to your paper I focused my attention on the good points in the western civilization as a set-off to Mr. Chitnavis's caricature of it. There was not one single word in my article which praised the 'Thrill Psychosis' or "the dare-devil catchphrase *I'll try anything once*". If I had been guilty of doing so, Mr. Dernier's article could have been properly characterised as a kind of rejoinder, but when I have not done this, it is not fair journalism to father views on me which I do not hold, and if necessary, would openly controvert. I trust in fairness to me you will kindly publish this letter in your next issue.

Mysore A. R. WADIA

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"————————*ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."

HUDIBRAS.

With this 36th number THE ARYAN PATH completes three years of existence. It has, we happen to know, provoked thought in many a mind; in a less measure, though not quite a negligible one, it has stirred the heart.

This is a season of resolves: "Let no one imagine that it is a mere fancy, the attaching of importance to the birth of the year. The earth passes through its definite phases and man with it; and as a day can be coloured so can a year. The astral life of the earth is young and strong between Christmas and Easter. Those who form their wishes now will have added strength to fulfil them consistently."—(H. P. Blavatsky). Therefore on this last page of the Volume we give a few pregnant sayings of true philosophers for meditation by our readers:—

The pathway through earth-life leads through many conflicts and trials, but he who does nought to conquer them can expect no triumph.

Prejudice based upon selfishness; a general unwillingness to give up an established order of things for new modes of life and thought; pride and stubborn resistance to Truth if it but upsets their previous notions of things—such are the characteristics of your age.

One who would have higher instruction given to him has to be a *true* theosophist, in heart and soul, not merely in appearance.

The truths and mysteries of occultism constitute, indeed a body of the highest spiritual importance, at once profound and practical for the world at large.

The passions, the affections are not to be indulged in by him who seeks to know; for they wear out the earthly body with their own secret power.

Since *akrshu* (attraction) and *prshu* (repulsion) are the law of nature, there can be no intercourse or relations between clean and unclean souls—embodied or disembodied.

Strong Will creates and sympathy attracts even adepts.

Union does indeed imply a concentration of vital and magnetic force against the hostile currents of prejudice and fanaticism.

People talk of the devil. For my part I have seen him; he was in my own heart.

He who lives in one colour of the rainbow is blind to the rest. Live in the light diffused through the entire arc, and you will know it all.

Every man contains within himself the potentiality of eternal death and the potentiality of Immortality, equilibrated by the power of choice.

Every time the Hindu pronounces the word *Om*, he renews his allegiance to the divine potentiality enshrined within the soul.

ULT LIBRARY
BANGALORE.
Accn. No 126

ॐ

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. III FEBRUARY 1932 NO. 2

TRUE ASCETICISM

Give up more than one personal habit, such as practised in social life, and adopt some few ascetic rules.—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

When Prince Siddhartha left his Queen and palace to seek Wisdom which would both explain and eliminate the woes of humanity, he went from school to school of ardent practitioners who were engaged in the same great quest. He came across that class of gaunt and mournful yogis, who regard the body as foe to the soul and therefore torture flesh and maim each limb, hoping "to baulk hell by self-kindled hells". In answer to the royal aspirant who enquired why they added ills to life which is so evil, they had no explanation to offer save that they had chosen that way; and in their turn asked—"speak, if thou knowest a way more excellent; if not, peace go with thee." It was before the Enlightenment; Gautama was not yet able to point the Royal Way—Raja-Yoga—but he felt that the Torturous Way—Hatha-Yoga—was wrong.

There is another class of false pietists of bewildered soul—those who have not the strength of will, the pluck to suffer, nor the courage to endure bodily chastisement, but who, nevertheless retire to convents and monasteries, ashrams and maths, where the power of flesh may not envelop them, where the senses may not encounter temptations.

Both these groups are far from the reality of the Second Birth.

In our own midst there are not a few who have freed themselves from the bondage of organized re-

ligions, but have not been trapped into materialistic agnosticism and atheism, and desire to seek the Way to Enlightenment. There are those who are trying to define the rules of the higher life under the title of a "new asceticism"; there are those also who are seeking a guru or a master in the highways and hedges—going to the West, or coming to the East. Some fancy that bodily training and breathing exercises will bring Wisdom, while others imagine that it matters not what one eats and drinks and says and does as long as inner aspiration is remembered and subjective peace is felt. Some seek visions and wonders; others despise them as not only worthless but meaningless, finding their satisfaction in the exercise of their own mental muscles. All such, however well-meaning, are "bewildered souls".

True asceticism belongs to the most ancient of sciences, the Kingly Science of Raja-Yoga. Raja-Yoga is the science of true æsthetics, the knowledge to be obtained through *higher* Feeling which is perceptive, vaguely called Intuition. Hatha-Yoga is the science of athletics, deals with bodily training at its best and with torturous control over bodily functions at its worst. The very first rule of that Kingly Science taught in the *Gita*, proclaimed by the Buddha, given in the *Voice of the Silence* is that the higher life is an inner process, and begins with an inner attitude.

> If thou art told that to gain liberation thou hast to hate thy mother and disregard thy son; to disavow thy father and call him "householder"; for man and beast all pity to renounce—tell them their tongue is false.
>
> Believe thou not that sitting in dark forests, in proud seclusion and apart from men; believe thou not that life on roots and plants, that thirst assuaged with snow from the great Range—believe thou not, O Devotee, that this will lead thee to the goal of final liberation.
>
> Think not that breaking bone, that rending flesh and muscle, unites thee to thy "silent Self". Think not that when the sins of thy gross form are conquered, O Victim of thy Shadows, thy duty is accomplished by nature and by man.
>
> The blessed ones have scorned to do so.

The teachings implied in the above piece of instruction should be fully applied.

Social life is not to be given up but only some personal habits practised in social life; not wholesale bodily asceticism is to be adopted but only some ascetic rules. The Divine Discipline taught in the *Gita* is "not to be attained by the man who eateth more than enough or too little, nor by him who hath a habit of sleeping much, nor by him who is given to overwatching". (vi. 16)

The principle of the higher life which leads to the Second Birth is this inner attitude and habit, from which outer deeds and behaviour naturally emanate. He who has purified his thoughts will find a clean tongue; he who speaks pure words will find his palate responding only to that sattvic food which the *Gita* defines, but not in terms of vegetarianism or meat-eating (*Gita* XVII-8). But consuming sattvic food will not bring forth true words or kind ones; mere utterance of holy sentences will not enlighten the mind. From within without is the basic law, and true asceticism observes it to the full, in the letter and in the spirit.

There are two unpardonable sins in the hidden life against which true asceticism warns. Each aspirant must fortify himself against them, and they may well become pointers to what is to be abandoned and what is to be adopted. They are—Doubt and Hypocrisy.

The best way to overcome doubt is to be true to one's self. In these columns last month it was shown how the development of Conscience is the first step, and it is the Voice of Conscience which subdues the Voice of Flesh, and evokes the Voice of Spirit. The use of Conscience removes doubts. Doubts are little concerned with our *beliefs*; they attack our clear perceptions, our knowledge, our highest visions. It is well to doubt that which confuses our reason, which shocks our intelligence, or weakens our moral stamina. Doubt which awakens to action the lethargic man of blind-belief is to be prized, as Browning taught. But to doubt our own convictions which are rooted in our reason and founded on our calmest reflection or highest vision and which are the teachings of the Sages is to commit the unpardonable offence. The ascetic rules to be adopted by each must conform themselves to such inner convictions. Mere aping of habits of others, however high in evolution or holy in life, is the wrong way of asceticism and proves disastrous.

The sin of Society is hypocrisy. Pleasant but insincere speech; white lies; glossing over our acts which our own reason pronounces wrong and our own moral perception condemns; explaining away blunders of omission and sins of commission; the simulating of a charitable and kindly spirit; the gossipy condemnation of people behind their backs under the guise of fearless criticism; indulgence in questionable deeds saying that one must experience everything;—all such are acts of hypocrisy, corrode soul-life and open the gates of hell. Battle must be given to any such personal social habits if they abide in us. The dread of being called sanctimonious must be faced, and saintly ways of true sanity should neither be abandoned, nor masked. Virtue and moral hygiene are laughed at as "goody-goodyness," but those who aspire to soul-life must not be daunted by petty criticism. Prudence may be scorned as prudery, a sense of justice to one's self may be attacked as selfishness—but nevertheless the ascetic rules positively applied by individuals in society will change the tone of that society.

Jesus was an ascetic—he never doubted the power and potency of his own spiritual-soul, his "father in heaven". And he was not a hypocrite; that is why he did not fear to break bread with wine-bibbers and harlots, nor to chase usurers, nor to attack rabbis.

Gautama was an ascetic—obtaining light about suffering and its cause, he adopted the begging bowl and unflinchingly pressed his way to the hearts of tyrants and untouchables and never failed to overcome hatred by wise compassion, which was his highest vision.

Krishna was an ascetic—seeing that war, and ruthless war at that, became necessary after his failure to secure peace with honour, for which he used all possible avenues, he led the Pandavas to the gory field of duty. The Master of his own Mercy stood unmoved amidst the havoc all around.

There are others, Twice-Borns, who overcame doubt and hypocrisy. But all such began that task as mortals in the world of soul-doubts and social-hypocrisy; all such took the inner resolve in the sanctity of heart-silence; all such, desiring to lift up high the banner of mysticism and proclaim its reign near at hand, gave the example to others by changing their own modes of life.

True asceticism is also true æstheticism. Doubt dies as old habits die; hypocrisy dies as mental and moral austerity is practised. Also, the Inner Perception of true Feeling deepens as well as widens as one lives out in family and in society one's own visions and convictions. Therefore,—

> Give up more than one personal habit, such as practised in social life, and adopt some few ascetic rules.

CIVILIZED LIFE.—*Crowded, noisy and full of vital power, is modern Society to the eye of matter; but there is no more still and silent, empty and dreary desert than that same Society to the spiritual eye of the Seer. Its right hand freely and lavishly bestows ephemeral but costly pleasures, while the left grasps greedily the leavings and often grudges the necessities of show. All our social life is the result and consequence of that unseen, yet ever present autocrat and despot, called* SELFISHNESS *and* EGOTISM. *The strongest will becomes impotent before the voice and authority of* SELF.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Lucifer*, October 1887.

EASTERN ART AND THE OCCIDENT

[**M. Jean Buhot,** the well-known Editor of *Revue des Arts Asiatiques* and an acknowledged authority on art, wrote in our issue of September 1931 on "Renaissance in Art Spiritual and Symbolic". He is a lover of the Orient and renders useful service to India as the Honorary Secretary of the Association Française des Amis de l'Orient.—EDS.]

It is well known that the whole Western world is at present going through a craze for everything that is or pretends to be—Oriental. A French author of conservative ideas, H. Massis, took the most gloomy view of this attitude, which he considered likely to shatter the cultural heirloom of the West; some other pessimists pointed out that the Romans had never taken an interest in the East until they were already on their downfall. In modern times, and particularly in France, we have known several fits of Orientalism. Our philosophers of the eighteenth century were interested in the Orient because of its ancient civilizations, which, though based on entirely different principles from ours, seemed to fare none the worse. Certain forms of Eastern art also were in favour, especially Chinese porcelain and Japanese lacquer. In the following generations the Egyptian expedition of Bonaparte (1798) and the conquest of Algiers (1830) turned the attention of painters and writers towards the Near East. In the 'sixties modern and popular Japanese art was discovered, and it certainly influenced several masters: Degas, Monet, Whistler, but I do not think it contributed anything to the brighter palette or to the realistic tendencies of the Impressionists, as has so often been stated. It helped them to break loose from certain conventions and that, after all, is the secret of every new development in art.

For the present vogue of things Oriental, we can, of course, discern several factors of unequal import and dignity.

And first there is a new feeling of human brotherhood, irrespective of nationality, religion, or race. The "colour" prejudice is, I may say, quite inexistent in France, and strongly repellent to the French nature—the last time some silly journalists tried to stir it up was on the occasion of the Russo-Japanese war. Nowadays a great many people travel or are called to work in the East—and this, by the way, is no negligible benefit of distant colonies—and as the Eastern peoples are better known, they are also better loved. Everything, of course, must have a beginning; accurate notions take a long time to sink into the popular mind. The "man in the street" still imagines Buddhism to be "the creed of all India," though he little realizes the considerable part played by Buddhist India in the civilization of the whole Far-Eastern world. Also Theosophical ideas reach a far larger circle

than that of professed Theosophists, and in view of the failure of Christianity, many earnest souls hope some new light will dawn upon them from Asia.

Taking now the question from the artistic standpoint, we find the same yearning for fresh inspiration. The wheel of fashion seems to revolve faster and faster, and, in order to satisfy a rather blasé public, artists must turn to every quarter of the globe for new ideas. I should think fully one half of the readers in the public library at Musée Guimet—the chief Oriental museum in Paris—are creative artists of some kind who try to stimulate their imagination by contact with Asiatic lore and Asiatic art: writers for the stage and the cinema, novelists, decorators, designers for fashions and textiles, etc. Some time ago I saw in an illustrated paper a snapshot of a princess on whose gown certain pleats were unmistakably borrowed from the Yakshīs of Bharhut! The great *Exposition des Arts Décoratifs* in Paris, 1925, gave evidence of a general ransacking of Eastern monuments. The Chü Yung Kuan gate at Nan-k'ou would be the latest thing for a "modern" Parisian doorway.

All this is very superficial, and I should hope, ephemeral. Nevertheless there is much in Eastern art which exactly meets the æsthetic requirements of our generation. Naturalism for instance (even in the English sense of the word) stands condemned. Art is conceived as a suggestion, not a representation of Nature. Perspective is now understood to be a mere convention, not a law as had been believed since the Renaissance. A knowledge of anatomy is considered as a help to a better understanding of movement, not as an end in itself. Cubists have long since broken up the conventional aggregates of subjects offered by Nature, and recomposed the elements according to their own vision. The Italian Futurists sought to express movement by the reduplication of forms. In short, the artist is completely free to express himself as he likes. Thus no one nowadays would criticize the Chinese painter for his bird's eye perspective, or the Hindu Sthapati for his images of deities with eight arms or four heads. That Rodin should have declared the Natarāja in the Madras museum a sublime masterpiece is no wonder, but I did feel moved when one day in 1922 two girls of fine feeling, though in a quite modest station of life, who certainly had never heard of this opinion, asked me where they could buy a Natarāja, or a cast of one!

I have no space to go into the many hints our architects draw from Chinese wooden architecture, for instance, and which fit in remarkably with the requirements of building in concrete; or into the various qualities that our artists admire in Eastern painting, sculpture, drama, etc. Eastern music is little known as yet, and I doubt if it will ever find in the West the congenial, tranquil, atmosphere which is essential to its enjoyment. "Le japonisme" *à la* Whistler who boasted, it is said, he could decorate a wall with a single butterfly—is out of fashion. But Chinese, and still more Indian, art is very much admired; it is even understood, but better perhaps from the *dilettante's* than from the artist's standpoint. What I mean is that the mental disposition of the Oriental artist and the psychological process of his creative work remain entirely foreign to his Western admirer and would-be imitator. Take for instance those marvellous representations of animals by Indian, Chinese, and Japanese artists. They could not have been drawn from nature, not even from quick sketches; besides, who ever heard of an Oriental artist pulling out a sketch-book in order to draw from life a bird on the wing? The animals must have been observed with a wonderful perseverance, and their infinitely varied aspects committed to memory and "visualized" when the time came for painting them. And the same is true of Oriental landscape and figure painting. Such an effort of concentration would make an Occidental's mind reel. Dr. A. K. Coomarswamy has repeatedly pointed out that the Indian artist has his picture, relief, or statue finished in his brain before he sets about the actual execution, much as the worshipper actually sees the Deity owing to his spiritual training. This sheds a certain light on the whole of Oriental art, though no European critic seems to have investigated the question as yet.

And again, consider the seething abundance and the sheer magnitude of many works of art in Asia, such as that cliff at Māvallipuram, ninety feet long by thirty high, where the descent of Ganga is carved; or the reliefs of Angkor Wat, with their minute detail, extending over hundreds of yards; or those of Boro-Budur, running up to a total length of two and a half miles! We cannot even realize how such an amazing unity of style and artistic perfection was ever attained, and how so many men of talent can have been content to work in the rank and file of artisans in order to carry out a collective masterpiece! There is no Western artist but craves more or less avowedly after personal recognition.

No study of Oriental art will, I think, be very profitable to the West until some attempt is made to imitate also the mental attitude of the Oriental artist.

JEAN BUHOT

A GREAT JNANA-YOGIN OF THE WEST*

[**Professor D. S. Sarma,** translator of the *Bhagavad-Gītā* (Students' Edition) and *The Gospel of Love* (Nārada Sutras) and author of *A Primer of Hinduism* is already known to our readers. Below we print an able, comparative study of western and eastern thought.—EDS.]

The soul is furious for self-knowledge. Her face is lit with passion, red with rage for the arrears withheld from her in God, because she is not all God is by nature, because she has not all God has by nature.

This rather startling passage in the writings of Meister Eckhart, who, like the ancient seers of India, deliberately set knowledge above love, reveals the intensity of his spiritual quest. It is a mistake to suppose that a Jñāna-Yogin is a mere dry-as-dust metaphysician or a cold intellectual theologian. On the contrary, the fires of God burn in him at a white heat, because he is in the last stages of assimilation to the Spirit. Eckhart himself employs in one of his sermons the figure of the consumption of fuel by fire to describe the progress of spiritual life.

It is God's intention to give Himself entirely to us. As fire to consume the wood must penetrate the wood, finding the wood unlike. That is a matter of time. First it makes it warm, then hot, then it smokes and crackles on account of its unlikeness; and the hotter the wood grows, the quieter and stiller it becomes; and the liker the fire, the more peaceful it becomes till at last it turns to fire altogether.

The fervour of devotion, the tumult of the soul in the presence of its Lord, the ecstatic dance and the feeling of "the cruel bonds of Love" are therefore to be looked upon as rather signs of spiritual immaturity. When the soul has traversed the full circle, it enters into peace that passeth understanding. Its virtues are still there, its orisons are still there, but they are all subordinated to the ineffable peace of pure Being. Blessed, indeed, are those who hunger and thirst after righteousness. But Meister Eckhart says that more blessed are those who hunger and thirst after the Presence of God; and most blessed are those who, having attained to the eternal "Now," hunger and thirst after nothing at all. Thus we have the three well-known stages of the mystic's progress—call them purification, illumination and union.

Most of Meister Eckhart's sermons, sayings and writings are concerned, like our own Upanishads, with the final stage of the spiritual journey. The soul's beatitude, its relation to Deity, the mutual relations of the three Persons of the Christian Trinity, and the nature of the Supreme Godhead—these are the questions to which he returns again and again, now explaining himself, now contradicting himself, now pouring his burning experience into the moulds of orthodoxy, and now letting himself go with an audacity and a boldness of speculation that brought on at last after his death the condemnation of Rome. But he has at the same time on almost every page illuminating and characteristic remarks on moral and devotional life which seem to be strangely in accord with the teachings of the mystics of India. It is not merely that Eckhart sets contemplative life above active life, for many a Christian mystic has done so crediting the psalmist with greater spirituality than the crusader. His affiliations to Indian thought are strongest in the great value he attaches to detachment in his scale of virtues, in his insistence on the soul's turning away from all creatures before attempting to seek God, in his recognition of the transitional character of all ethical achievement, and above all in his conception of Godhead as a purely passive Essence of which nothing can be predicated and with which the emancipated soul is ultimately to be identified.

According to Eckhart, detachment from all creatures is the highest virtue whereby a man may knit himself most closely to God and wherein he is most like to his Exemplar. He extols detachment above love, above humility, and above mercy or kindness, and concludes by saying, "In short, when I reflect on all the virtues, I find not one so wholly free from fault, so unitive to God as is detachment". In another place he says, "I would have you know that to be empty of creatures is to be full of God, and to be full of creatures is to be empty of God". At the same time he teaches that "to abandon all things in mortal guise is to recapture them in God where they are in reality". This last is, by the way, a sufficient answer to those who, like Walter Pater, describe the mystic's renunciation of this world of bright colours and beauteous forms in his quest for the Absolute as a foolish attempt at escaping "into a formless and nameless, infinite void, quite evenly gray".

Again and again Meister Eckhart advises the religious aspirant to empty his mind of images of creatures and to cultivate what he calls "spiritual poverty". With that love of division and subdivision which is so characteristic of the medieval mind he speaks of five kinds of poverty—devilish poverty, golden poverty, willing poverty, spiritual poverty and divine poverty. The first applies to all who have not what they would fain have of riches and whose lack is their hell. The second applies to those who in the midst of their riches pass in and out unaffected by them. The third applies to those who renounce all their riches with a good grace. The fourth applies to those who are quit of all good works as well as their goods or property. And the fifth applies to those "whose riddance is both without and within and whose minds are bare and free from all contingent form".

Meister Eckhart, by Franz Pfeiffer, translated by C. de B. Evans, was reviewed in our pages by John Middleton Murry in June 1930. A companion volume II has now been issued by the same publishers—John M. Watkins, 21 Cecil Court, Charing Cross Road, London. Vol. I—20s.; Vol. II—12s. 6d. —EDS.

It is to be observed that in speaking of the fourth kind of poverty, which he terms spiritual poverty, Meister Eckhart approximates closely to the teachings of the *Gita*.

God seeks not His own, He is perfectly free in all His acts, which He does in true love. So does the man who is at one with God: he is perfectly free in all his deeds; he does them out of love and without why, just to glorify God.

With this we may compare the following verses from the *Gita*:—

There is nothing in the three worlds, O Arjuna, for me to achieve, nor is there anything to gain which I have not gained. Yet I continue to work. (III. 22)

Works do not defile me; nor do I long for their fruit. He who knows me thus is not bound by his works. Men of old who sought deliverance knew this and did their work. Therefore do thy work as the ancients did in former times. (IV. 14, 15 and 16)

That is, all actions should be performed in a spirit of worship and self-effacement. When they are so performed the agent attains spiritual freedom, he achieves what Eckhart calls spiritual poverty, for he works and yet he works not. It is God that works in and through him.

They are quit of all good works: the eternal Word does all their work, while they are idle and exempt from all activity.—*Eckhart.*

Therefore arise and win renown; subdue thy foes and enjoy a prosperous kingdom. *By Me they have been slain already. Be thou merely an instrument, O Arjuna.—Gita.*

Like all Jñāna-Yogins of India, Meister Eckhart is emphatic about the ancillary position of all purely ethical achievement in spiritual life. He defines virtue as a mean between vice and perfection and says that the fruit of virtue will never be obtained until the soul is caught up above virtues. According to him the perfection of virtue consists in freedom from all virtues.

The utmost a spirit can attain to in this body is to dwell in a condition beyond the necessity of virtues; where goodness as a whole comes natural to it, so that not only is it possessed of virtues, but virtue is part and parcel of it: it is virtuous not of necessity but of innate good nature. Arrived at this the soul has traversed and transcended all necessity for virtues; they are now intrinsic in her.

To the soul which thus perfects itself in virtues, especially in the supreme virtue of absolute detachment, comes the Grace of God. Meister Eckhart, using naturally the terms of Christian symbolism, loves to call it the birth of the Son in the soul.

When the soul is free from time and place, the Father sends His Son into the soul.

Why do we pray or why do we fast or do our work withal? I say, so that God may be born in our souls. What were the Scriptures written for? And why did God create the world and the angelic nature? Simply that God might be born in the soul.

Sometimes this central fact of spiritual life to which religious souls of all ages and countries bear witness Eckhart expresses directly, without the Christian symbolism, as in the following passage:—

He does not come as anything at all, nor yet as gaining something for Himself, but He comes ordering. He who was hidden comes and reveals Himself. He comes as the light which lay concealed in people's hearts and in their minds, now taking shape in intellect and will and in the deepest being of the soul.

We are reminded of the words of the *Gita*:—

Out of compassion for them do I dwell in their hearts and dispel the darkness born of ignorance by the shining lamp of wisdom.

Hindu scriptures teach us that, though the soul is divine, it is subject to *upadhis* (limitations) on account of its *avidya* (ignorance). These prevent it from realising its identity. The soul need not acquire any new qualifications for its salvation. It has only to get rid of its disqualifications. For salvation, which means eternal life in God, is not something that is made, but something that is only realised. "Not by creation is the Uncreated to be gained," says the Upanishad. And how startlingly near is Meister Eckhart to the Indian sages when he says:—

Though we are God's sons we do not realize it yet . . . . Sundry things in our souls overlay the knowledge and conceal it from us.

According to him the soul is double-faced. Its upper face is in eternity, and there it knows nothing of time nor of body. But its lower face is turned downwards and operates in the world of the senses, of space and time. The former, of course, is the noblest part of the soul. Eckhart calls it by various names—the tabernacle of the soul, the spiritual light, and most frequently, the divine spark. And it is there that God brings to birth His only Son, imprinting on the soul His own likeness. The oftener this divine birth takes place in one's soul, the closer grows one's union with God, the more abundant is the flow of divine Grace.

But living in Grace, "living as sons in His Son and being the Son Himself" is not the highest state. Like the ancient Hindu mystics, Eckhart courageously goes forward where his experience leads him. One of the Upanishads says: "Now if a man worships another deity, thinking the deity is one and he is another, he does not know."—*Brihad.* (I. iv. 10) Eckhart does not stop with the state of Grace. For Grace is after all, as he says, creaturely. As long as the soul is in Grace, he feels it is still confined. Sometime or other it must ascend in Grace and finally transcend it before it can see God. Nay, more. To reach the centre of Godhead, to be one with the Divine Essence the soul must be bereft not only of all creaturely activity and divine Grace, but also of "God" Himself.

It sounds strange that the soul must lose her God, yet I affirm that in a way it is more necessary to perfection that the soul lose God than she lose creatures. Everything must go. The soul must subsist in absolute nothingness. It is the full intention of God that the soul shall lose her God, for as long as the soul possesses God, is aware of God, knows God, she is aloof from God.

When Eckhart is on this highest plane of thought and experience in which he is most at home he makes a number of statements regarding Godhead, God, the Logos and the soul which are perfectly familiar to us in this country, but

which are like bomb-shells thrown into the edifice of orthodox Christian Theism, or, for the matter of that, any Theism which obstinately wants to keep its chambers air-tight. First of all, as we have already said, he exalts gnosis over love in the final stage of spiritual life in a way which is bound to be distasteful to the average Christian. By knowledge, of course, he does not mean empirical knowledge which comes through the senses, understanding and reason, but the divine knowledge which comes through the kindling of the divine Spark in the soul—what we really mean by the Sanskrit word Jñāna, namely, life in, as well as knowledge of, God.

> Understanding is the head of the soul. The superficial notion is that love stands first. But the soundest arguments expressly state (what is the truth) that the kernel of eternal life lies rather in knowledge than in love.

He takes his stand on the words of Christ, "This is eternal life, to know Thee the only true God" and argues thus:—

> Our best authorities declare that knowledge is nobler than love. Love and will take God as being good. If God were not good, will would have none of Him; if God were not lovely, love would scout Him. But understanding would not. Knowledge is not confined either to good or to love or to wisdom or lordship. By putting names to God the soul is only dressing Him up and making a figure of God. Nor is this the doing of knowledge. Though God were neither good nor wise, still understanding would seize Him; it strips everything off, not stopping either at wisdom or good, nor majesty nor power. It pierces to naked being and grasps God bare, ere He is clothed in thought with wisdom and goodness.

The distinction that Eckhart draws between the unqualified and quiescent Godhead and the active beneficent God of love and power, who is eternally bringing forth His Son in the universe and in the soul of man, is closely parallel to the distinction that is drawn in the Vedanta between Nirguna Brahman and Saguna Brahman, or Iśvara, as will be seen from the following extracts:—

> Goodness, wisdom and anything else that we attribute to God are impurities with God's abstract essence.
>
> God and Godhead are as different as earth is from heaven . . . God works, Godhead does not work, here is nothing to do; in it is no activity. It never envisaged any work.
>
> In the abstract Godhead there is no activity: the soul is not perfectly beatified until she casts herself in the desolate Deity, where neither act nor form exists, and there merged in the void loses herself; as self she perishes and has no more to do with things than she had when she was not.

And, lastly, we come to the vexed question of the state of the emancipated soul. It is precisely here that Eckhart's teaching is most unacceptable to the orthodox Christian, for he stops at nothing short of the absolute identity of the soul with God. He says:—

> Now there is nothing foreign nor aloof betwixt God and the soul, therefore she is not *like* God; she is identical with Him, the very same as He is.
>
> Thou shalt lose thy thy-ness and dissolve in His His-ness; thy thine shall be His Mine, so utterly one Mine that in Him shalt thou know eternalwise His is-ness, free from becoming: His nameless nothingness.

We are here reminded of the well-known passage in the Upanishads:—

> As the flowing rivers disappear in the sea losing their name and form, so does the knower freed from name and form go to the Divine Being greater than the Great. He who knows that highest Brahman becomes Brahman.

The teaching of this great Jñāna-Yogin of the West on points such as these is particularly valuable to the students of Vedanta in India, because what he says is derived more or less from his own spiritual experience and maintained against the authoritative doctrines of his Church, and consequently it is somewhat of an independent testimony to the great truths taught by the ancient Hindu seers. Unfortunately, *these truths which are the outcome of the unique spiritual intuitions of our race are too often taught in this country as hardened doctrines and repeated by every tyro in theology in such a light-hearted and supercilious manner as to make a truly religious man shudder with fear and disgust.* That God is an ineffable perfection, that our human categories of thought, will and feeling cannot but fail to describe the essential unity of His Being, that personality is only the highest kind of symbol we can employ to denote the various phases of His nature as they appear to us, and that in the highest experience of the soul's communion with Him the barriers that usually surround it fall off and disappear making it continuous with the Infinite Consciousness, in which there is neither far nor near, neither this nor that, neither then nor now—these and similar teachings of our Upanishads are not mere articles of a creed or the suppositions of faith, but statements of fact based on actual experience. They remain, of course, mere intellectual formulæ giving no spiritual sustenance to one, so long as they are not reconverted into facts of individual experience. Just as our physical strength depends not on the stores of food we have at our disposal, but on the quantity that we can really digest and assimilate, so also our spiritual strength depends not on the experience of the Rishis stored in our Scriptures, but on that part of it we can really make our own.

D. S. SARMA

MODERN SUPERSTITIONS

[**G. B. Harrison, M. A. (Cantab.) Ph. D. (London)**, of the London University, was visiting Professor of English in the University of Chicago in 1929. He was in India and Mesopotamia during the War. He is the author of *Shakespeare: the Man and His Stage* (with E. H. G. Lamborn) *England in Shakespeare's Day, John Bunyan: A Study in Personality, The Lancaster Witches 1612,* and is the Editor of *The Bodley Head Quartos.*

That superstition in connection with omens and dreams, crass ignorance about talismans and the practice of sundry occult arts prevail to-day, as always, is a fact. It is no more surprising than the persistence of the superstition (*a*) that all supernormal phenomena are "stuff and nonsense" or (*b*) that there is not and that there cannot be any basis or any explanation of them. The antidote to superstition is knowledge, and our generation will do well to begin with the view that all bizarre and out-of-the-way forms of nonsense are but shadows, however distorted, of realities. The two volumes of *Isis Unveiled* by H. P. Blavatsky are replete with the exposure of the false and the exposition of the true in the realm of psychic forces and occult phenomena.—EDS.]

It is a common belief, which a judicious selection of historical facts will seemingly confirm, that we are more enlightened than our poor fathers. Witches, for instance, practise with such ill success that they are fallen beneath the contempt of the law; so that if a scholar chance to reprint some old treatise of witchcraft, critic and reader will complacently murmur "incredible days," congratulating themselves that new science has confounded old superstition. Yet Englishmen who believed in witchcraft and persecuted witches three centuries ago were in other respects not void of intelligence; the generations of Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Donne, of Bacon, Harvey, Hooker, or later of Thomas Browne, were not palpably inferior to our own. Whence arise two doubts: whether the superstitions of the past were not more solidly founded in fact than would nowadays appear; and whether our own age has not its full share of credulities which hereafter will be derided as incredible superstition.

Superstition is of various kinds. Often it is a debased and imperfect kind of science, taking the form of undue respect, which arose from a hasty mistaking of result and cause, for mishaps following such phenomena as crossed knives, ill-omened numbers, ladders, black cats, spilt salt, Fridays, grandmotherly sayings, Scriptural texts, and the like. These are passive superstitions.

Active superstitions, whereby believers would gain some knowledge or effect by magical practices, are not less common. In the daily paper which insures me against common mischances, there is often to be found a large advertisement of a mascot that has brought luck to thousands, and not least to its purveyors. Clairvoyants and palmists still flourish, though in some

apprehension of the law, which may however commonly be evaded if the witch or wise woman conceal her calling under some title compounded with "psycho". Yet few of us can have avoided the experiences of credible and sane friends that would confirm such practices. Within the last six years a neighbour village in Essex quietly boasted of its witch, and not long ago I was told of three instances where a love spell from *The Golden Bough* was used with immediate and embarrassing success and subsequent huge disaster.

On the whole our behaviour is seldom coloured by active superstition in normal times; but once favourable conditions exist, even the hardiest is tainted; for no man can be certain of his reason when he is afraid. Civilized man is less prone to superstition than barbarous, because civilized man lives more safely; but when civilization no longer protects, then fear returns, and superstition. . .

This was well seen during the Great War, when emotions were stretched tight and vibrated to every touch of fear. Hidden witchcrafts were uncovered, and superstition reappeared in all the old forms; conjurations of the dead, visions of angels, charms, protective and malignant magic, enormous gullibility, multitudinous lying. Witches indeed were no longer persecuted as such but the old thrill of a witch hunt was recreated in a new spy mania, whereby the general fear was embodied in a local scapegoat. One instance is typical of many. An unhappy being happened to speak English with a guttural accent; how could he be other than a German spy? And the charge was confirmed when he was reported to have smiled to himself in a sardonic and sinister manner during an air raid. Thereafter he was hounded into suicide by the murmurings of his neighbours. Whenever the calm of society is disturbed, credulity soon shoves down science. We are apt to forget that so long as we can read the newspaper daily the great liar has small openings for the practice of his craft; but let a general condition of ignorance be re-established and universal lying is immediately rampant, as happened in the General Strike when newspapers disappeared for a few days.

It is not however beliefs and practices—of which we are really ashamed—that will appear so incredible to our children; but rather those institutions which we accept without question as eternally fit. Whilst we send a policeman or his wife to spy in disguise upon a palmist, we regard a bishop or a clergyman as personally and professionally respectable. And yet even the mildest ritualistic curate claims enormous supernatural powers over matter and spirit which are well beyond scientific demonstration. Not only is the curate immune from prosecution as a mountebank, his creeds are by law established, and his person respected so highly that his testimonial on certain kinds of documents is accepted above all others, except a magistrate's.

Even the law itself, which we regard as peculiarly an instrument of light, has its superstitions and cruelties, as of old. The administration of justice is based upon the optimistic belief that anyone is capable of speaking the truth, the whole truth, and indeed nothing but the truth, months after the fact, in the emotional atmosphere of a law court, at the promptings of a skilled and hostile barrister, and before a large audience. In such a theatre matters of life and death are decided; but any teacher or scientist knows how hardly even an intelligent student is taught to comprehend a fact, let alone to reason from it.

Doubtless the hearty barbarities of older days have disappeared, but there remains an infinity of mental torment in the slow progress of the murderer from arrest to the gallows, as he faces the agonies of a coroner's inquest, a magistrate's court, the assizes, the Court of Appeal, the petition, and at last the hangman, the whole series of torments perhaps spread over six months or more. The victim, it is true, was murdered, but only once. And as for those who behave abnormally because their bodies are abnormal the law still regards hard labour as the fittest treatment for *corpus insanum*.

Indeed, in the procession of ideas, to-day's superstition is but yesterday's creed; and our creeds of to-day will decompose into superstition to-morrow. Could we but go forward three centuries to read of "The Folklore of the Twentieth Century," we should find ourselves lumped with our forefathers among the backward and barbarous civilizations.

G. B. HARRISON

There must be truth and fact in that which every people of antiquity accepted and made the foundation of its religions and its faith. Moreover, as Haliburton said, "Hear one side, and you will be in the dark; hear both sides, and all will be clear." The public has hitherto had access to, and heard but one side —or rather the two one-sided views of two diametrically opposed classes of men, whose *primâ facie* propositions or respective premises differ widely, but whose final conclusions are the same—Science and Theology. And now our readers have an opportunity to hear the other—the defendant's—justification and learn the nature of our arguments.

Were the public to be left to its old opinions: namely, on one side, that Occultism, Magic, the legends of old, etc., were all the outcome of ignorance and superstition; and on the other, that everything outside the orthodox groove was the work of the devil, what would be the result?

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. II, pp. 794–5.

THE REBIRTH OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION

[**George Godwin** wrote in our July issue on "Crime and Punishment".

Last month M. Hugh I'A. Fausset writing on the subject of Intuition pointed out the danger of a lop-sided growth of human intellect in the Western world. Mr. Godwin strikes the same note in reference to the whole of Western civilization and, in looking forward to a change for the better, visions the Ideal of "Universal Brotherhood," the emergence of "Eternal Values," and a life of "Self-Fulfilment". These closely correspond to the three objects of H. P. Blavatsky's Theosophical Movement. Our author who writes with vigour and discernment does not see the fount of these spiritual impulses in "formalised religion" which "is divorced from life" as it is from "the precepts of Christ". He advocates seeking of Eternal Values. But how can one arrive at "Eternal Values"? How bring conviction of his view that "all the Sages of the world have come finally upon the same truth"? A new philosophy of life is what the Western world needs. That new philosophy is very old; its central thought may be thus expressed in the words of a Great Indian Sage known to but very few:—

> Teach the people to see that life on this earth, even the happiest, is but a burden and an illusion; that it is our own Karma, the cause producing the effect, that is our own judge—our saviour in future lives—and the great struggle for life will soon lose its intensity.

Yes, the West must turn to the East.—EDS.]

Western civilization is the concrete product of a certain philosophy of life. It is a philosophy that emphasizes and stresses the prime importance of man's dominion over the material forces of the external world in which he moves and has his being: it is the philosophy of material power, it is the worship of machines.

In its simplest form it takes the material success of the individual as the *summum bonum* of life. From earliest childhood's days the mind of the child is coloured and stained by an ideology that postulates the virtue of acquisition.

Virtue in life is "To get on," and moral precepts and moral values are inculcated chiefly that they may be the instrument of this purpose.

Thus the western adage has it that honesty is the best policy. That is, honesty is recommended because it promises material dividends.

The result of such early teaching is inevitable. It produces a mental condition that views life as a competitive struggle in which every man's hand is against that of his neighbour; while between States it produces jealousies and animosities inherent in the intense and often ferocious struggle for territory and raw materials. Although many wars have been waged on grounds ostensibly moral and idealistic, any careful analysis of the causes that went before them reveal their true origin in the philosophy that postulates the imperative importance of material power.

This is the philosophy that has produced the chaotic condition of the modern world, and it might

be termed the Philosophy of TO HAVE

Now just as the artist's concepts of beauty and significant form condition the quality of his creations, so the mass philosophy of life of any civilization inevitably determines the quality of its social, political and economic activities. The creator, in short, is revealed in the thing created, and so one might say that every age makes of itself, unwittingly, a spiritual self-portrait.

What is this portrait of the modern world, and what does it reveal? It is a picture that provides us with a clinical representation of disease, for *materialism, now at its nadir*, moves swiftly towards an inevitable collapse.

It is the Nemesis that inevitably overtakes and overwhelms action that proceeds from false ethical values. Western civilization, as we know it, is moving swiftly to collapse because from its birth it has been nurtured with false concepts of the purpose of man's life upon earth.

It may be argued that this is no more than the inevitable destiny of every human society—the Spenglerian destiny that foredooms every civilization, birth, growth, decay and death. And it is true enough that no civilization, expressed in terms of the concrete, has survived: all that the past teaches us is the survival value of the Absolute.

Beauty does not perish, nor does holiness. And no age that flowered richly in these qualities has perished. This is true of the ancient Greece of Praxiteles and Plato, of the India of the Ramayana and the Mahabharata—true of every civilization that has caught and held to values transcending those of our modern materialistic age.

The distinction is fundamental and vital: it is the conflict between two totally opposed conceptions of life. On the one hand we have the philosophy of TO HAVE, on the other, the philosophy of TO BE. Differently expressed, it is the conflict between materialism and a spiritual conception of man's nature.

One who has succeeded by western standards put the matter thus: "It is necessary to be a realist: life is a wolf's game. It is every man for himself." And if one is to judge by works, then, both as regards normal conduct as between individuals and the tolerated anarchy that exists in the international sphere, that statement crystallizes a universal conception of human relations. Incidentally, it points us to the heart of the problem of the modern world, so often envisaged as one amenable to mechanical solution. That problem lies in the heart of man and nowhere else.

There can be no reconstruction of western civilization without a spiritual renascence. The yard-stick by which all reformative programmes in the social, economic and political fields must be measured is the yard-stick of spiritual values.

From what fount will these spiritual impulses gush? Surely

not from formalised religion, for the religion of the western world no longer colours the lives and activities of those who profess it. It is divorced from daily life. For where can one see evidence of any attempt to practise those precepts of Christ to which this monstrous civilization gives lip-service?

To love one's neighbour as oneself is a hard precept to live up to in a world where every man seeks gain at the expense of his brother.

To lay up for oneself no treasure upon earth is a counsel of perfection that has a strange ring in a world that reckons poverty in itself as a crime.

Look upon modern materialism as expressed in the acquisitive society of the western world and you perceive that it has taken the Beatitudes and practised their inversion. There is no place for the pure in heart, for the humble, for them that sorrow, for love is the outcast and has no place in this philosophy—the philosophy of TO HAVE.

Mechnikoff, in his *Disharmonies in Nature*, demonstrated the many ways in which man's physical form reveals a perpetual adaptation to a changing physical environment, yet never achieves a perfect harmony with it.

In the picture of the western world to-day, one sees evidence of another sort of disharmony: it is that of man's soul-lag. His intellectual apparatus has advanced too swiftly. He has become master of giant forces. He has grasped mighty instruments to power. He has become godlike in his domination over natural forces. His machines have made him mighty.

And what has he made of it?

Modern civilization is like a great ship navigated by an idiot. It plunges forward, but no man can foretell its landfall.

At this moment of writing there are in the world millions who lack for sufficient bread. Yet the granaries of Canada stand full.

In countries dishonoured by abject poverty and shameful housing conditions, skilled workers are busy producing the toys of the rich.

War stands universally condemned; yet the nations, giving lip-service to perpetual peace, continue to arm.

And behind all these distracting phenomena lies one sole cause of them: it is man's spiritual myopia, his worship of the God of TO HAVE.

The world does not need action: it needs meditation. Action has been preached as a virtue in itself, irrespective of its objectives. We call for bigger and better houses, bigger and better battleships, bigger and better business. What we need is bigger and better souls.

It took the stupendous opportunities of our modern world to reveal man's unfittedness to use them wisely. Every potential blessing he has turned into a curse. Life has become, not more beautiful, but more horrific. Fear lies like a shadow over the world. But it is not the primeval fear of the first man. It is not fear of the wrath of the gods or of the

malignant elements: it is fear of himself, of his own kind. That dominating fear is inevitable in a world wherein the ideal of universal brotherhood has yet to be recognized.

Man has acquired sufficient scientific knowledge for the next century. He needs now, more than anything else, a quiescent period wherein to learn how to use the powers of which he has possessed himself.

And that means that humanity must turn from the problems of the external world to the greater mysteries of the human soul. Man must cease to pursue material ends and turn to ends that are spiritual. For *unless man masters himself and governs his life by the eternal values, all his triumphs must turn to disaster.*

Materialism has been accorded an enthusiastic trial: and it has failed. It becomes daily more and more apparent that its philosophy is false, its values contemptible. When one looks upon its face we see something that is evil, monstrous, diseased.

But, even so, we see that from the death of this world order may be born something finer, a human society in which the ancient ideals of brotherhood and spiritual development will cease to be the empty phrases of an effete priesthood and become realities in the daily lives of men.

Maybe, out of the chaos of the present order will emerge another less concerned with the machinery of life, more concerned with living. But before that is possible there must come a rebirth.

For, after all, of what does intrinsic life consist if not of the inward life which is the life of the spirit?

But modern man is so deafened by the roar of the machines, so intoxicated by speed, so engrossed in the accumulated material wealth, that he is only now beginning to perceive that the pinnacles of those monstrous towers which he has raised to Mammon totter.

For the truth can no longer be denied: the whole vast edifice of the modern world begins to disintegrate. It may be made to function yet a little longer, but its ultimate doom is certain.

What will the man of to-morrow put in its place? If he turns for a solution to the cunning of his brain, he will produce something ostensibly different, but intrinsically the same. He will devise a New Materialism. But it will still be a materialism, even though it have guarantees against slaughter and pitiless exploitation.

The hope of the world lies in a change of heart. It lies in the application of teachings that were old when Jesus Christ walked the hills of Palestine. For if you examine the wisdom of the past you will perceive that *all the Sages of the world have come finally upon the same truth.* And it is this: That man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

Emancipated from his lust to possess, man may turn to a new way of life when his objective will be self-fulfilment through the practice of the ancient virtues.

We see the modern world as a vast number of pressing problems, whereas there exists but one problem, and that the problem of man himself. The solution of the evils of the world lies in the hearts of men and nowhere else. The modern world is the monument of the vanity of earthly desires. It is a picture of spiritual disease. It is futility made manifest.

And the other path?

It is the way of the spirit. This is the affirmation of wisdom in all the ages—a denial of the doctrines of materialism.

If man struggles to-day against evils that threaten to overwhelm him, it is not because he is the victim of an unkind fate: it is because he is the victim of himself.

Those evils have sprung up upon the soil of the philosophy of TO HAVE. They will be overcome only when man turns to the philosophy of TO BE.

For that which is evil bears evil. And that which is good bears good. Which is to say: By their fruits shall ye know them.

Maybe man will master the machines that now master him and will use them merely to make possible an earthly existence consecrated to the nurture of his lagging soul.

The problem of the modern world is a spiritual problem and the materialism of the modern world moves to an inevitable doom because, by implication, it denies that truth.

The intellect of man has led him into darkness, and only by the light of the lamp of his soul will he climb back into the clear light of spiritual day.

Then his desire will be TO BE.

For he will then perceive that no man may amass and possess riches, though some may by their riches be possessed.

But before that can be, all that modern materialism stands for must go.

It is, indeed, already going. For its doom is inherent in its denial of man's spirit. And that denial is its Nemesis.

But out of death comes rebirth and renewal. What will follow the collapse of the West? No man can say: the answer is locked in a hundred million human hearts.

GEORGE GODWIN

SOME ALCHEMISTS OF ISLAM

[**Dr. E. J. Holmyard** is too old a contributor to need an introduction. In our second number (February 1930) he noted the "extreme antiquity of the alchemical tradition". In the present article he gives an interesting sketch of four great Islamic exponents of the Science.—EDS.]

One of our leading authorities, Dr. Charles Singer, has recently stated that, in investigating a medieval document, the first question a scholar asks himself is whether it shows signs of Arabian influence. To such a degree is Western thought indebted to the learning of early Islam that scarcely any of the older branches of knowledge are devoid of Muslim impress. Theology, logic, philosophy, mysticism, music, astronomy, medicine and physics, all owe much not merely to the wisdom of Hellas preserved and transmitted by the enthusiasm and earnest labour of Arabic-writing scholars, but to independent contributions peculiarly Muslim in character. Avicenna, Averrhoes, Ghazzali, Omar Khayyam, Ibn Khaldun, Al-Kindi, Qusta ibn Luqa, have carved their names indelibly in the temple of human intellectual achievements; and Muhammad himself has brought spiritual insight and comfort to millions of our fellow men.

Among all the mental activities of medieval Islam, few were cultivated with greater skill and assiduity than the science or art of alchemy. Some account of the fundamentally important work of Jabir ibn Hayyan has already appeared in these pages; but Jabir was merely the first of a long line of accomplished chemists and alchemists, whose powers of experiment were necessarily limited, but whose capacity for abstract thought reached a very high level. With the expansion of the Islamic Empire, men of widely diverse races adopted the language of Arabia as their medium of literary expression, and even at the present day many Arabic words are to be found in the technical vocabularies of science. Among those adepts who acquired fame as notable exponents of alchemical doctrine were two Western Muslims, Ibn Arfa' Ra's and Maslama al-Majriti, and two Eastern, Abu'l-Qasim al-'Iraqi and Aidamir al-Jildaki.

The first of these four men is properly called Abu'l-Hasan Ali ibn Musa ibn al-Qasim, but he usually went by the name of Ibn Arfa' Ra's for reasons which have not come down to us. He is stated to have died at Fez in 1197 A.D., but may in reality have been nearly a century earlier. It is probable that he resided for some time in Spain, at Madrid, since he is occasionally described as al-Andalusi ("the Andalusian") and al-Majriti ("the man of Madrid"). Details of his life are but scanty, though we may hope that future research will illuminate much that is dark at present; indeed, an investigation of chemistry in Moorish Spain would doubtless be of the utmost value for a proper understanding of the development of the science. The principal work of Ibn Arfa' Ra's is an alphabetically arranged collection of verses upon the philosopher's stone, known as *The Particles of Gold*. Written for the most part in that elegant and stately metre known as *Tawil*, they are noteworthy both for their real poetic merit and for their comprehensive expression of contemporary alchemical philosophy of the esoteric kind. They are by no means easy to understand, and many of the technical terms they contain are not to be found in the lexicons; but fortunately the author himself has left us a commentary on them, in the form of a dialogue with his pupil, Muhammad ibn Abdullah. Another commentary was made by Aidamir al-Jildaki, to whom we refer again later, in his work entitled *The Extreme of Delight*, several manuscripts of which are still extant. A third commentator remarks that Ibn Arfa' Ra's modelled his book upon the writings of Ares or Horus, of the Greek alchemist Theodorus, and of the Omayyad prince Khalid; "the inner meaning of his words," we are assured, "is clear to everyone who examines them with the Eye of Initiation". Like the much earlier adept Dhu'n-Nun of Egypt, Ibn Arfa' Ra's lays stress upon the mystical aspect of alchemy, expressing his views in allegorical language; yet he seems to have had some acquaintance with laboratory operations.

Maslama al-Majriti, *i.e.* Maslama of Madrid, was a celebrated astronomer and mathematician who flourished in Spain under the beneficent rule of the Caliph Al-Hakam II (961–976). By native authorities, he is credited with the authorship of a remarkable alchemical treatise entitled *The Sage's Step*, and is also said to have written *The Sage's Goal*, a work on magic well known to medieval Europe in the form of its Latin translation *Picatrix*. Unfortunately, there is more than a little doubt as to the correctness of this ascription, since, from internal evidence, we should judge that both works were composed after 1009 A.D., while Maslama is stated, on good authority, to have died in 1004 or 1007. The author—whoever he was—says in *The Sage's Step* that the best indication of the truth of the possibility of transmutation is its actual accomplishment, and that the alchemist should therefore practise his hand in operation, as well as his eye in observation and his mind in reflection. This extract alone is sufficient to show us that the author was mainly concerned with practical physical alchemy, and although he calls in the use of talismans and other magical agencies, he reveals himself throughout as a man thoroughly at home in the laboratory—a skilful experimentalist deeply versed in chemical processes and manipulations. Several of his descriptions of operations with metals, such as cupellation and the separation of silver from gold, are entire-

ly unambiguous in language, and can be followed with ease by a modern chemist.

As to the science of alchemy, he maintains that its foundation lies in geometry and arithmetic. For this mathematical training, he recommends the student to read Euclid and the *Almagest* of Ptolemy; after which he should turn his attention to the works of Aristotle, Democritus, Hermes and Apollonius of Tyana. The last two names are of interest as demonstrating yet again the belief, widely held among Muslim alchemists, that alchemy originated in the hidden lore of ancient Egypt. There is much to be said for this belief, and an interesting point in its favour is to be found in connection with that central jewel of alchemical literature, the *Tabula Smaragdina* or *Emerald Table* of Hermes. The most ancient known text of this perpetual enigma is contained in one of the authentic books of Jabir ibn Hayyan (*ca.* 722–803 A. D.), who claims to have taken it from Apollonius of Tyana. The latter, again, is said to have discovered a secret chamber in which a figure of Hermes sat on a golden throne holding the inscribed Emerald Table in his hands. Now Mr. Theodore Gaster has called attention to the fact that the Egyptian *Book of the Dead* contains a strikingly similar story, in Chapter LIV, where it is stated that "this chapter was found at Khmun [Hermopolis] on an alabaster [or lapis-lazuli] plaque, under the feet of the Majesty of the venerable god [Thoth or Hermes] in the writing of the god himself".

According to *The Sage's Step*, the base metals are, in reality, gold infected with various accidental or non-essential qualities. If these are removed, the metal assumes its true form of gold. There is (the book continues) only one Elixir, in spite of the contrary asseverations of many adepts. It is threefold in power, and is insoluble in water and incombustible. If projected upon imperfect metals, under appropriate conditions, it will transmute them into gold or silver; such transmutation is possible on account of the fact that the prime matter is the same in all metals.

These theories, except for the statement that there is only one Elixir instead of the usual two, are found more fully elaborated in the writings of an accomplished alchemist of the thirteenth century, Abu'l-Qasim al-'Iraqi. Although presumably a native of 'Iraq, Abu'l-Qasim seems to have lived and studied in Cairo, somewhere between 1250 and 1300. In 1250, the Mameluke Sultan Al-Mu'izz the Turkoman came to the throne, and appears to have thrown open to scholars the treasures of the library collected in the tenth century by the learned Caliph Al-Mu'izz li-Din Allahi. Abu'l-Qasim tells us that he studied no less than 40 quintals (some 2 tons!) of these books, and he certainly shows considerable familiarity with early writers on alchemy, both Muslim and Greek. Of his own works, the most interesting are the *Book of the Seven Climes* and the *Book of Knowledge Acquired concerning the Cultivation of Gold*. The former contains an explanation of the enigmatical language employed by the alchemists, and of the disrepute into which alchemy had fallen. Briefly expressed Abu'l-Qasim's argument runs as follows: For the maintenance of the social order mutual service is essential, since not all men possess the technical ability to satisfy their needs. Should the knowledge of the method of preparing the Elixir become common property, every one would be rich and would therefore not need to work; hence the community would soon cease to exist. It is thus necessary to cloak the science of alchemy in obscure language, in order to prevent its dissemination among the vulgar. The "dark sayings" of the alchemists are due to their recognition of this fact. When, however, men took the allegories literally, and naturally failed to get satisfactory results, there was a reaction against alchemy, and the science fell into bad odour.

In the *Cultivation of Gold*, of which an English translation was published at Paris in 1923, Abu'l-Qasim's main thesis is that metals feed, grow and reproduce. The object of alchemy should therefore be to obtain the seed of gold and then to grow it in a suitable soil, such as mercury. Since, however, metals do not possess the power of rejecting unassimilable matter, the food that is supplied to them must be carefully prepared beforehand, in order that it may be completely absorbed. If this precaution is not taken, the seed of gold would, on growth, give rise to an impure, or mixed, metal. This theory is developed at some length, and numerous quotations from earlier alchemists are adduced in support of it. The book is by no means free from allegory, but Abu'l-Qasim was a clear and logical thinker, and there are unmistakable signs that he knew the discipline of the laboratory. His other works offer an attractive and promising field for research.

Aidamir al-Jildaki, who also lived for part of his life at Cairo (where he was still writing in 1360), is of importance chiefly on account of his extensive and deep knowledge of Muslim alchemical literature. In the preface to his commentary on Abu'l-Qasim's *Cultivation of Gold* he relates that he spent more than 17 years in the study of alchemy, and that he sat at the feet of numerous masters of the art in Iraq, Asia Minor, Morocco, Egypt, Syria, the Yemen and the Hejaz. He studied the works of both ancient and modern authors, and their operations upon compounds and mixtures, and finally arrived at a perfect knowledge. From the amazing bulk of his writings, it is evident that he must have used the major portion of his existence in collecting and explaining all the books upon alchemy that he could discover. Practically all the great European and Cairene libraries have manuscript copies of one or more of his treatises, and in Muslim countries he is even yet studied by

contemporary adepts. Among the innumerable points of interest displayed before us so lavishly, Al-Jildaki presents a complete lineage of alchemy, which he traces from Moses through Solomon and David to Alexander, Aristotle, and Socrates, thence to the Caliph Ali, Khalid and Jabir, and finally to such "moderns" as Al-Farabi, Rhazes, Avicenna and Abu'l-Qasim.

ERIC J. HOLMYARD

When it becomes undeniably proven that the claim of the modern Asiatic nations to a Secret Science and an esoteric history of the world, is based on fact; that, though hitherto unknown to the masses and a veiled mystery even to the learned, (because they had never the key to a right understanding of the abundant hints thrown out by the ancient classics), it is still no fairy tale, but an actuality—then the present work will become but the pioneer of many more such books. The statement that hitherto even the keys discovered by some great scholars have proved too rusty for use, and that they were but silent witnesses that there do exist mysteries behind the veil which are unreachable without a new key—is borne out by too many proofs to be easily dismissed. . . . No human-born doctrine, no creed, however sanctified by custom and antiquity, can compare in sacredness with the religion of Nature. The Key of Wisdom that unlocks the massive gates leading to the arcana of the innermost sanctuaries can be found hidden in her bosom only: and that bosom is in the countries pointed to by the great seer of the past century Emanuel Swedenborg. There lies the heart of nature, that shrine whence issued the early races of primeval Humanity, and which is the cradle of *physical* man.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Secret Doctrine* Vol. II, 795 & 797.

I. THE SYMBOLISM OF THE CROSS

[**Maurice A. Canney, M. A.,** Professor of Semitic Languages and Literature, Manchester University, is also the Editor of the *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*. In 1925 he was the S. N. Ghosh Lecturer in Comparative Religion at Calcutta University. Outside of his special work he has for over thirty years been occupied with the Study of Comparative Religion. He is a contributor to many British and Foreign Journals. Some articles in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, *Hastings' Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, and in *Harmsworth's Universal Encyclopædia*, are from his pen.

In the following simple presentation the learned author examines but one aspect of the ancient Aryan symbol; it is well to remember that "every symbol yields three fundamental truths and four implied ones, otherwise the symbol is false". It was to this that Plutarch referred when he said—"The mystic symbols are well known to us who belong to the 'Brotherhood' ". In her *Secret Doctrine*, Vol. II, pp. 573–589, H. P. Blavatsky gives a profound and masterly exposition on "The Cross and the Pythagorean Decade" to which we must draw the attention of our author and others. We must also refer them to *Isis Unveiled* I, 508 and II, 253–55. While the student and the scholar will find these explanations most valuable, all will profit by a perusal of her article "Cross and Fire" reprinted from *The Theosophist* for November 1879.—EDS.]

Fifty years ago most people believed that the cross was a purely Christian symbol, and to have said anything to the contrary would have been regarded as rank heresy. Even in 1899 I was reprimanded severely by a review-writer because it was stated in the article "Cross," which I contributed to the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, that "the magic virtue ascribed to the cross has doubtless a non-Christian origin". Yet this was only a mild way of saying what is now accepted almost as a commonplace. Some of the evidence for the antiquity and wide distribution of the sign of the cross is to be found now in the volume of Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* published in 1911. It was J. K. Cheyne, Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford and Canon of Rochester Cathedral, who pointed out to me that the cross as a magical and religious symbol is very much older than Christianity. And, in passing, it is interesting to recall that this very remarkable scholar, having come at the end of his life to realize, with the insight and foresight of a true prophet, that one of our greatest needs, and perhaps our greatest need, is a reconciliation of religions, decided to adopt a world religion, and became an adherent of Bahaism. His last book, entitled *The Reconciliation of Races and Religions* and published in 1914, gives a sympathetic account of the new faith.

The cross and the triangle are two of the oldest and most widespread magical or religious symbols. Their antiquity is shown

clearly by the fact that in the old Hebrew alphabet the fourth letter has the form of a triangle and the last letter that of a cross. The triangle became in course of time a favourite Jewish symbol, and, like some other symbols, it was doubled to express the idea of an intensification of the power or significance ascribed to it. There is good reason to believe that the cross also was used as a sign or symbol by the Hebrews, and that there are references to its use in the Old Testament, though these references are obscured in the English translations. In the Book of Ezekiel (ix. 4, 6) we read of marking a cross on the foreheads of the faithful in Jerusalem who were to be spared from slaughter. It has been a common idea that the cross has power to avert evil. In the Book of Job (xxxi, 35), Job is represented as exclaiming, "Lo, here is my cross!"—though what exactly he means is not clear. Coming down to New Testament times, the eminent Aramaic scholar, Gustav Dalman, tells us that the Jewish passover lamb, which had according to the Jewish law to be roasted, was laid in the oven (*tannūr*) upon a spit in the form of a cross.

Now there is no reason to believe that Jesus anticipated a disastrous end to his ministry.* He hoped to live to establish the Kingdom of God upon earth. It is true that this is sometimes described as the Kingdom of Heaven; but Heaven was sometimes another name for God, so both expressions mean the same thing. Actually, the ministry of Jesus terminated abruptly when, after being haled before Pilate, he was condemned to death and, in accordance with Roman, but not with Jewish, practice, was crucified. There is no good reason to suppose that Jesus in his darkest moments anticipated such an end to his work on earth. To a Jew the cross of crucifixion was a thing of shame, an accursed tree. To the Jewish Christians the cross of Jesus was a stumbling-block. True, Jesus in a few passages of the Gospels is represented as saying that to be his disciple a man must deny himself and take up his cross and follow him (*Mark* viii, 34; *Matthew* xvi, 24; *Luke* ix, 23; cp. *Matthew* x, 38, *Luke* xiv, 27). But either the phrase was a current expression, or it was interpolated in the light of the subsequent crucifixion of Jesus. That the second possibility is likely, is suggested by the story of the rich young man who, according to *Mark* x, 17–21, (*Luke* xviii, 18–30), came to Jesus to ask what he should do to gain age-long life. Jesus is represented as saying to him: "One thing thou lackest. Go, sell whatever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come, follow me." There is nothing here about taking up a cross. To be a true disciple of Jesus, the man is told to give up his riches and his life of luxury, to abandon his stately home, and to take to the open road. This is what it means,

* *cf.* H. P. Blavatsky's *Isis Unveiled* II, 545—EDS.

or rather what it meant, to be a Christian missionary.* Again, in the story of the lawyer who wished to gain age-long life (*Luke* x, 25–37) nothing is said about taking up the cross. In order to "live" (v. 28), that is to say, to live truly, he is told to minister to the afflicted wherever he may find them and to relieve their afflictions.

Jesus died upon the cross. This was an unexpected catastrophe, and came as a great shock to his followers. They were puzzled to account for such an end, and sought to understand what it meant. Then, after a time, by the well-known psychological device or habit of rationalisation, the Apostle Paul and other Christian leaders hit upon several theological explanations. According to the writer of the Fourth Gospel, when John the Baptist saw Jesus coming to him, he said, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away (or beareth) the sin of the world" (*John* i, 29). Just as the Hebrews sacrificed animals to make atonement for sin, or were supposed to have sacrificed them for this purpose so Jesus was sacrificed on the cross to appease an angry God, and to make atonement for the sins of mankind. Similarly, Paul speaks of Jesus having effected a reconciliation between God and man "through the blood of his cross" (*Colossians* i, 20 ff.). This revolting idea is very prominent in Christian hymns, but it may be said, I think, to have been abandoned by most Christians in modern times. The prevailing idea now, another idea found in the Christian hymns, is that Jesus died a martyr to the truth, as he understood it. But this has been true of others than Christians.

There is a third idea, which is prominent also in Christian hymns, the idea that the cross symbolises new life. When the first shock of the crucifixion had been overcome, some of the early Christians, to whom the cross as a symbol was familiar, saw in the Christian cross not so much the instrument of death as the sign of life. The cross came to be identified with the instrument used by the ancient Egyptians to give new life to mummified bodies, an instrument known as "the sign of life" (*ankh*) and even referred to by modern scholars as "the cross of life". And so understood, the symbol does serve to express an idea which, according to the Aramaic tradition, was of the very essence of the gospel of Jesus. In connection with his teaching about the Kingdom of God, Jesus insisted that health and holiness are bound up with right living or with a right idea of life. What the Greek calls "salvation" the Aramaic (Syriac) expresses as "life". When the Greek says "Saviour" (*Sōtēr*) the Aramaic (Syriac) says "Life-giver" (*Machyānā*). Where the Greek says, "Thy faith has saved thee," the Aramaic (Syriac) says, "Thy faith

*In the other passages referred to above Jesus may have said that a disciple must deny himself and *take up his staff* and follow him. In the light of his subsequent crucifixion, this would be changed to *take up his cross*.

hath given thee life". So the Church Father Ephraem Syrus speaks of "the living cross". And the later writer of the Syriac Apocryphal Acts of Thomas speaks of the cross as "the living and life-giving cross," as "the living sign," and as "the sign of life". He speaks also, with true understanding of the gospel of Jesus, of a Christian putting on "the new man" and entering upon "the new life".

MAURICE A. CANNEY

II.—CROSS AND FIRE

Perhaps the most widespread and universal among the symbols in the old astronomical systems, which have passed down the stream of time to our century, and have left traces everywhere in the Christian religion as elsewhere,—are the Cross and the Fire—the latter, the emblem of the Sun. The ancient Aryans had them both as the symbols of Agni. Whenever the ancient Hindu devotee desired to worship Agni—says E. Burnouf *(Science des Religions*, c. 10)—he arranged two pieces of wood in the form of a cross, and, by a peculiar whirling and friction obtained fire for his sacrifice. As a symbol, it is called *Swastica*, and, as an instrument manufactured out of a sacred tree and in possession of every Brahmin, it is known as *Arani*.

The Scandinavians had the same sign and called it Thor's Hammer, as bearing a mysterious magneto-electric relation to Thor, the god of thunder, who, like Jupiter armed with his thunderbolts, holds likewise in his hand this ensign of power, over not only mortals but also the mischievous spirits of the elements, over which he presides. In Masonry it appears in the form of the grand master's mallet; at Allahabad it may be seen on the Fort as the Jaina Cross, or the Talisman of the Jaina Kings; and the gavel of the modern judge is no more than this *crux dissimulata* as de Rossi, the archæologist calls it; for the gavel is the sign of power and strength, as the hammer represented the might of Thor, who, in the Norse legends splits a rock with it, and kills Medgar. Dr. Schliemann found it in *terra cotta* disks, on the site, as he believes, of ancient Troy, in the lowest strata of his excavations; which indicated, according to Dr. Lundy, "an Aryan civilization long anterior to the Greek—say from two to three thousand years B. C." Burnouf calls it the oldest form of the cross known, and affirms that "it is found personified in the ancient religion of the Greeks under the figure of Prometheus "the fire-bearer," crucified on mount Caucasus, while the celestial bird—the *Cyena* of the Vedic hymns,—daily devours his entrails. Boldetti, (*Osservazioni* 1., 15, p. 60) gives a copy from the painting in the cemetery of St. Sebastian, representing a Christian convert and grave-digger, named Diogenes, who wears on both his legs and right arm the signs of the *Swastica*. The Mexicans and the Peruvians had it, and it is found as the sacred Tau in the oldest tombs of Egypt.

It is, to say the least, a strange coincidence, remarked even by some Christian clergymen, that *Agnus Dei*, the Lamb of God, should have the symbols, identical with the Hindu God Agni. While *Agnus Dei* expiates and takes away the sins of the world, in one religion, the God *Agni* in the other, likewise expiates sins against the gods, man, the manes, the soul, and repeated sins; as shown in the six prayers accompanied by six oblations. (*Colebrooke—Essays*, Vol. I, p. 190.)

If, then, we find these two—the Cross and the Fire—so closely associated in the esoteric symbolism of nearly every nation, it is because on the combined powers of the two rests the whole plan of the universal laws. In astronomy, physics, chemistry, in the whole range of natural philosophy, in short, they always come out as the invisible cause and the visible result; and only metaphysics and alchemy—or shall we say *metachemistry*, since we prefer coining a new word to shocking skeptical ears?—can fully and conclusively solve the mysterious meaning. An instance or two will suffice for those who are willing to think over hints.

The Central Point, or the great central sun of the Kosmos, as the Kabalists call it, is the Deity. It is the point of intersection between the two great conflicting powers—the centripetal and centrifugal forces, which drive the planets into their elliptical orbits, that make them trace a cross in their paths through the Zodiac. These two terrible, though as yet hypothetical and imaginary powers, preserve harmony and keep the Universe in steady, unceasing motion; and the four bent points of the Swastica typify the revolution of the Earth upon its axis. Plato calls the Universe a "blessed god" *which was made in a circle and decussated in the form of the letter X*. So much for astronomy. In Masonry the Royal Arch degree retains the cross as the triple Egyptian Tau. It is the mundane circle with the astronomical cross upon it rapidly revolving; the perfect square of the Pythagorean mathematics in the scale of numbers, as its occult meaning is interpreted by Cornelius Agrippa. Fire is heat,—the central point; the perpendicular ray represents the male element, or spirit; and the horizontal one the female element—or matter. Spirit vivifies and fructifies the matter, and everything proceeds from the central Point, the focus of Life, and Light, and Heat, represented by the terrestrial fire. So much, again, for physics and chemistry, for the field of analogies is boundless, and Universal. Laws are immutable and identical in their outward and inward applications. Without intending to be disrespect-

ful to any one, or to wander far away from truth, we think we may say that there are strong reasons to believe that in their original sense the Christian Cross—as the cause, and Eternal torment by Hell Fire—as the direct effect of negation of the former—have more to do with these two ancient symbols than our Western theologians are prepared to admit. If Fire is the Deity with some heathens, so in the Bible, God is likewise the Life and the Light of the World; if the Holy Ghost and Fire cleanse and purify the Christian, on the other hand Lucifer is also Light, and called the "Son of the morning star."

Turn wherever we will, we are sure to find these conjoint relics of ancient worship with almost every nation and people. From the Aryans, the Chaldeans, the Zoroastrians, Peruvians, Mexicans, Scandinavians, Celts, and ancient Greeks and Latins, it has descended in its completeness to the modern Parsi. The Phœnician Cabiri and the Greek Dioscuri are partially revived in every temple, cathedral, and village church; while, as will now be shown, the Christian Bulgarians have even preserved the sun worship in full.

It is more than a thousand years since this people, who, emerging from obscurity, suddenly became famous through the late Russo-Turkish war, were converted to Christianity. And yet they appear none the less pagans than they were before, for this is how they meet Christmas and the New Year's day. To this time they call this festival Sourjvaki, as it falls in with the festival in honour of the ancient Slavonian God Sourja. In the Slavonian mythology this Deity—Sourja or Sourva,—evidently identical with the Aryan *Surya*—sun—is the god of heat, fertility, and abundance. The celebration of this festival is of an immense antiquity, as, far before the days of Christianity, the Bulgarians worshipped Sourva and consecrated New Year's day to this god, praying him to bless their fields with fertility, and send them happiness and prosperity. This custom has remained among them in all its primitive heathenism, and though it varies according to localities, yet the rites and ceremonies are essentially the same.

On the eve of New Year's day the Bulgarians do no work, and are obliged to fast. Young betrothed maidens are busy preparing a large *platiy* (cake) in which they place roots and young shoots of various forms, to each of which a name is given according to the shape of the root. Thus, one means the "house," another represents the "garden"; others again, the mill, the vineyard, the horse, a cat, a hen, and so on, according to the landed property and worldly possessions of the family. Even articles of value such as jewellery and bags of money are represented in this emblem of the horn of abundance. Besides all these, a large and ancient silver coin is placed inside the cake; it is called *bábka* and is tied two ways with a

red thread, which forms a cross. This coin is regarded as the symbol of fortune.

After sunset, and other ceremonies, including prayers addressed in the direction of the departing luminary, the whole family assemble about a large round table called *paralyá*, on which are placed the above mentioned cake, dry vegetables, corn, wax taper, and, finally, a large censer containing incense of the best quality to perfume the god. The head of the household, usually the oldest in the family—either the grandfather, or the father himself—taking up the censer with the greatest veneration, in one hand, and the wax taper in the other, begins walking about the premises, incensing the four corners, beginning and ending with the East, and reads various invocations, which close with the Christian "Our Father who art in Heaven," addressed to Sourja. The taper is then laid away to be preserved throughout the whole year, till the next festival. It is thought to have acquired marvellous healing properties, and is lighted only upon occasions of family sickness, in which case it is expected to cure the patient.

After this ceremony, the old man takes his knife and cuts the cake into as many slices as there are members of the household present. Each person upon receiving his or her share makes haste to open and search the piece. The happiest of the lot, for the ensuing year, is he or she who gets the part containing the old coin crossed with the scarlet thread; he is considered the elect of Sourja, and every one envies the fortunate possessor. Then in order of importance come the emblems of the house, the vineyard, and so on; and according to his finding, the finder reads his horoscope for the coming year. Most unlucky he who gets the cat; he turns pale and trembles. Woe to him and misery, for he is surrounded by enemies, and has to prepare for great trials.

At the same time, a large log which represented a flaming altar, is set up in the chimney-place, and fire is applied to it. This log burns in honour of Sourja, and is intended as an oracle for the whole house. If it burns the whole night through till morning without the flame dying out, it is a good sign; otherwise, the family prepares to see death that year, and deep lamentations end the festival.

Neither the *momtzee* (young bachelor), nor the *mommee* (the maiden), sleep that night. At midnight begins a series of soothsaying, magic, and various rites, in which the burning log plays the part of the oracle. A young bud thrown into the fire and bursting with a loud snap, is a sign of happy and speedy marriage, and *vice versa*. Long after midnight, the young couples leave their respective homes, and begin visiting their acquaintances from house to house, offering and receiving congratulations, and rendering thanks to the deity. These deputy couples are called the *Souryakari*, and each male carries a large branch ornamented with red ribbons, old

coins, and the image of Sourja, and as they wend along sing in chorus. Their chant is as original as it is peculiar and merits translation, though, of course, it must lose in being rendered into a foreign language. The following stanzas are addressed by them to those they visit.

Sôurva, Soûrva, Lord of the Season,
Happy New Year mayst thou send ;
Health and fortune on this household,
Success and blessings till next year.

With good crops and full ears,
With gold and silk, and grapes and fruit ;
With barrels full of wine, and stomachs full,
You and your house be blessed by the God. . .
His blessing on you all.—Amen ! Amen ! Amen!

The singing Souryakari, recompensed for their good wishes with a present at every house, go home at early dawn . . . And this is how the symbolical exoteric Cross and Fire worship of old Aryavarta go hand in hand in Christian Bulgaria. . . . .

H. P. BLAVATSKY

"Lift thy head, oh Lanoo ; dost thou see one, or countless lights above thee, burning in the dark midnight sky?"

"I sense one Flame, oh Gurudeva, I see countless undetached sparks shining in it."

"Thou sayest well. And now look around and into thyself. That light which burns inside thee, dost thou feel it different in anywise from the light that shines in thy Brother-men?"

"It is in no way different, though the prisoner is held in bondage by Karma, and though its outer garments delude the ignorant into saying, 'Thy Soul and My Soul'."

The Secret Doctrine, Vol. I, p. 120.

SYNTHESIS

[**J. D. Beresford's** article suggests the intimate relation which exists between the synthesising process taking place in the mind of a single individual and his perception of the unity inhering in humanity and even in the whole of nature. One who has integrated himself, who has synthesised his different constituents, who has become whole, so that he is as one newly born, naturally sees Life as impartite, and humanity as one unit. Our author points to the last quarter of the nineteenth century as the period during which the spirit of division gave way to that of synthesis. Coincidently (!) we may point out that it was during that quarter that H. P. Blavatsky started her Theosophical Movement (in 1875) with its prime object of Universal Brotherhood ; wrote *Isis Unveiled* (1877) to expose the weakness of religious creeds which divide men, and the danger of specialization through which species of materialism—doubt, agnosticism and atheism—express themselves ; recorded her *Secret Doctrine* (1888)—the synthesis of science, religion, and philosophy ; gave to the world *The Key to Theosophy* (1889) so that aspirants may learn and teach in their turn ; and finally made the gift of *The Voice of the Silence*, which sings of the Path of Compassion, of Love Immortal and Impersonal.—EDS.]

One of the most obvious limitations of the average human mind is its natural tendency to specialisation and sectarianism. The principle of "one thing at a time," admirable enough, perhaps, from some points of view, leads inevitably in some cases to one thing all the time. Men adopt, at quite an early age as a rule, a profession, a political party, a religious belief, an attitude towards life, a taste for this or that, a particular hobby, and these objects of his adoption exercise an increasing influence upon his mentality and character as he comes to middle age. He can think more easily and surely upon the lines of his original choice,—though, indeed, in many cases, there has been no deliberate selection on his part. He has become familiar with all the methods and detail involved; and so he comes at last, a confirmed specialist within his own limitations, to see any subject presented to him only in the terms of his own activities, beliefs and personal tastes. If the subject be such that it cannot be included within this range, he rejects it as being "beyond him". He has narrowed his powers to the point at which they are no longer able to function on unfamiliar lines.

In the nineteenth century, now beginning to fall into a historical perspective that admits of new generalisations, this process of specialisation stands out as a distinctive mark of the common tendency of the period. In religion, in science, in politics, in the professions and trades, in the social orders, the developing process of civilisation worked by a splitting into sub-divisions, which might be likened to islands in a small archipelago, separated from, yet having comparatively easy communication with, the surrounding islands, but cut off by difficult stretches of ocean from the many other archi-

pelagos representing different habits of belief, thought, occupation, manners, even of speech. In the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century, if a man wished to emigrate from the archipelago in which he had been born, he had to begin his pilgrimage at an early age.

In religion this analysis into sects was and is still very active. The process which had begun, speaking broadly, in the Christian Religion by the separation of the Orthodox Eastern Church from Rome, had been followed by Protestantism, and continued by Nonconformity, developed all kinds of strange variants. The specialising influence of the time seemed to demand an increasingly stricter range of belief for different types not only of mind but of occupation, with an inevitable crystallisation of the original Spirit of Christianity upon any string that might be furnished by a particular reading of the letter. Also, since science and general knowledge were attracting to themselves a growing number of those who had hitherto departmentalised religion as a formal but comparatively uninteresting necessity of existence, the ranks of what were then known as "Atheists," were greatly augmented; and Atheism, Agnosticism or Materialism came by degrees to take place as the definite expression of a recognised attitude.

Beyond this, but keeping our attention still on the thought—as opposed to the social—levels of the time, science and general knowledge themselves were peculiarly specialised. Experimenters, researchers, professors and workers were expected to keep to their own school. Biology, physics, chemistry, geology, astronomy were studied for the most part as separate sciences, and it was believed that the more closely a student confined himself to his own study the greater were his chances of success. The enormous expansion of technical knowledge of every kind was such that it seemed impossible for anyone of average ability to do more than master the details of his own pursuit. A man might in his leisure exchange ideas with other islanders for his own archipelago, but all his work was done within the boundary of his own island.

It is still difficult to put a finger very precisely either upon what might be called the crisis of this process or upon the influences that are leading to its slow disintegration. In what is known as "exact knowledge," however, we can trace the evidence of a rapidly growing tendency for the various departments of science to overlap. Discoveries in pure physics had such an obvious bearing on chemistry upon one side and astronomy upon the other, that in the past generation the physicist may be either chemist or astronomer. The biologist had to come out of the dissecting-room to consult with the geologist. And, speaking generally, it would seem that all the more important scientific discoveries of the past fifty years have tended to throw light upon

departments of knowledge other than that in which they were originally made. Thus the liaison between the sciences grows more marked with every decade. It is as if the islands of this particular archipelago were drawing together to form a continent.

But what of the larger synthesis? For, this small instance of which I have been writing presents but one aspect of a movement that is, I believe, of the profoundest importance to the whole world. Are there any indications that in many other directions, also, this diastole of general expansion is changing to the systole of a general synthesis? Let me as an illustration quote from the extraordinarily able presidential speech of General Smuts to the Meeting of the British Association, held in London last Autumn, as reported in the *Times* of September 24.

Referring to his summary of the recent work done in science, General Smuts continued:—

> Among the human values thus created, science ranks with art and religion. . . . . More and more it is beginning to make a profound aesthetic and religious appeal to thinking people. Indeed, it may fairly be said that science is perhaps the clearest revelation of God to our age. . . . .
>
> While religion, art and science are still separate values they may not always remain such. Indeed, one of the greatest tasks before the human race will be to link up science with ethical values, and thus to remove grave dangers threatening our future. A serious lag has already developed between our rapid scientific advance and our stationary ethical development, a lag which has already found expression in the greatest tragedy of history.

And in his conclusion he suggested that "at the present cosmic epoch we are the spectators of what is perhaps the grandest event in the immeasurable history of our universe," a universe that he described as holistic, in which man "is in very truth the offspring of the stars".

Now General Smuts is, as we know, primarily scientific in his manner of thought, and I am not here asking readers of THE ARYAN PATH to regard these excerpts from a very long speech as representing an expression of the Inner Wisdom, nor even of my own views with regard to the coming place of science in human thought and development. But these quotations from an address made to an audience almost exclusively composed of scientists, undoubtedly represent a remarkable change of attitude towards the use and purpose of knowledge. We see that the effects of new discovery are in the direction of "holism," (a neologism, coined, I believe, by General Smuts himself a few years ago), defined in the New Oxford Dictionary as the "tendency in nature to form wholes that are greater than the sum of the parts by creative Evolution". We are given reasons for the belief,—to use for the last time a metaphor which can be pressed no further—that we must regard not only the islands of each archipelago as drawing together, but also the new continents that are thus formed. In short, I claim that all the evidence goes to prove that the great crisis was passed in

the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and that at that point the long processes of separation, specialisation, departmentalisation in knowledge and of sectarianism in religion, began to give place to the large synthetic movement that will eventually replace knowledge by wisdom.

I remember writing more than twenty years ago two articles for a London evening journal under the title of "Wanted: A Condenser". No copy of it exists now, so far as I know, and the journal in question, *The Westminster Gazette*, is no longer in being. But so far as my memory serves, I claimed even then that the expansion of learning could not be continued indefinitely, that presently all branches of it would necessarily overlap, and that it was possible in some distant age that all the knowledge of the world might be summed into a single sentence, or even a single word. At that time, I myself believed the idea to verge on the fantastic, —a belief which certain readers of the journal in question severely underlined in letters to the Editor —but, now, I realise that however immature that early essay of mine, it had its inspiration in some fragment of imperfectly recognised knowledge drawn from the deep well of truth.

But if we may now assume that in the future all departments of learning will become fused by slow degrees into the essential wisdom, which will itself become simplified and more inclusive as the spirit of man grows in strength and consciousness, we have still to consider what should be the purpose and desire of that average, specialised individual whom I took as my illustration at the beginning of this article.

For we are all, saving a few, a very few initiates and mystics, held very straightly in this grip of specialisation. We—and I emphatically include myself in this immense category—are constrained by that ideal of the self which we have both, consciously and unconsciously, cultivated from the first moment that we have been aware of our personal identity. Quite early in our lives we begin to limit that self by the adoption of points of view about this and that, and these early opinions whether derived from experience or accepted from an outside source, tend to harden and crystallise towards middle age so that they constitute for us the appearance of fundamental truths.

Nor does the fact that such beliefs may be in their nature essentially ethical and altruistic, avoid some, at least, of the limiting consequences of such a restriction. We may admire a man who devotes all his life to the service of humanity, and such a one is surely nearer to the true path than the man who lives principally for his own bodily satisfaction. But we cannot fail to realise,—I could instance cases from my own experience—that even this profession of altruism is not enough. It is not enough because in most cases the impulse does not spring from the right source, but is, in effect, a rigid discipline, a form of asceticism imposed by the reason; and to act righteously is not the same thing as to love righteousness. And the mark of the failure in such modern ascetics is to be found in the fact that they do not grow in self-realisation. They experience no extension of consciousness, and I have known men who have lived such lives of self-sacrifice, become narrower and more fanatic in their old-age, victims to a form of specialisation.

The alternative to this is to avoid all those outgrowths of belief that harden into dogma; and Christ, one of the very greatest of the initiates, condensed all the commandments into the single direction "Love one another," an ideal that, if it is in its entirety too great for our present conception as a rule of life, carries implications that provide the surest direction towards the true path.

For Love is an aspect of that great synthesis of which I am writing. All its opposites, hate, jealousy, self-seeking,—our language is characteristically rich in synonyms for the thing that Love is not,—are aspects of division, separation, segregation, drawing apart. Love, in all its attributes, demands a drawing together, an inclusion, a simplification. But we must not confine it by our habit of specialisation. It is well to love simply and truly those who should naturally be dear to us. But we must extend our sympathies far beyond that tiny circle, if we are to play any part in the determination of the great synthesis that cannot include less than the whole of humanity.

J. D. BERESFORD

THE GIFT OF THE DHARMA

MAHAYANA BUDDHISM IN THE WEST

[**M. G. Mori** has many friends among our readers. The following article makes a very interesting suggestion about the Mahayana School of Buddhism. Eastern Esotericists and Occultists recognize the value of the School. H. P. Blavatsky's *The Voice of the Silence* throws great light on the pure Mahayana Teachings.—EDS.]

The educated Westerner . . . is attracted to Buddhism but . . . is a little bit inclined to find it rather too coldly intellectual for him. There are great numbers of people in the West who have lost all faith in the dogmas of Christianity, but who have not lost their yearning for something greater than themselves which they cannot define, and which they cannot find outside themselves. They come to Buddhism, finding its doctrines reasonable and attractive from an intellectual point of view, but they do not find that warmth, the really religious atmosphere they seek. That is to be found in mystical Buddhism: in the Mahayana doctrine of the indwelling Buddha.

Thus wrote an esteemed British Buddhist friend of mine in a personal letter which reached me late in 1930; and I take the liberty of quoting his remarks here as a piece of wise counsel to those of us Orientals who are not only interested in, but sincerely hope for, the spread of the Buddha Dharma in the West. Europe has made us the gift of a great material civilization, the benefits of which cannot, in justice, be denied merely on the ground of its evils. It is time that the East seriously cast about for some suitable present in return, and I for one suggest the noble gift of the Dharma. If gladly accepted and utilized with even half as much zeal as we in Japan have made use of their gift of material civilization, our spiritual gift will bring the Europeans immeasurable benefits without any of the evils that would accompany a more "substantial" present. It will cure them of the ultra-materialism which has brought them into their present predicament and lift them on to a higher plane of spirituality. That will prove a blessing not only to the white man himself but to the whole of humanity.

But as any gift will be all the more appreciated if it takes the form of that which its recipient has been feeling himself greatly in need, I think it both natural and legitimate for us to see to it that our gift of Buddhism should be in that shape which will most strongly appeal to the educated European of to-day. I should be the last man to suggest that we degrade or otherwise modify the teachings of the Buddha so as to make them agreeable to the average European of worldly ambitions. To do so indeed would be little short of suicidal for the true Buddhist cause. But it is well to remember, as I endeavoured to point out in my first article in this magazine (Vol. I, No. 1), that Buddhism has its "positive" or "constructive" side as well as its (apparently) negative side. To

some minds, indeed, the "negative" side may make its appeal as being really more "masculine," for it is on this side that Buddhism emphasizes that "man's destiny is in his own hands," so that "he can only save himself". Here we have atheism in the sense that Buddhism refuses to recognize any divine creator of the universe who can in some miraculous way control the fates of men and save or damn them at his own caprice. Those who have strong confidence in their powers of physical and spiritual endurance will, therefore, find this teaching manly and ennobling. The steeper and more rugged the peak, the greater will be its attraction for the blithe mountaineer.

The thoroughly intellectual and passionless outlook on life and the world—past, present and future—here outlined will perhaps also appeal to the pure "man of science" and all others who have formed the habit of looking at everything in the crystal light of reason. But most of us, whether Orientals or Occidentals, are not made of such stuff. We have our emotional side, and in many of us this predominates over the intellectual or volitional side. This is what makes us "human" in the common sense of the word, and whether we like it or not we have to accept this dual constitution of our temperaments as a fact. And here, I think, is the *raison d'être* of Mahayana Buddhism, with its "religious atmosphere" so congenial to the man of emotion. Here we have Buddhas and Bodhisattvas credited with super-human intelligence and powers. We have not only "deified" the Buddha Sakya-muni (Gautama), and "worship" him almost as a "divine" being, but also have such Tathagatas as Maha Vairoçana ("Dainichi") and Amitabha ("Amida"), who are (superficially, at least) akin to gods. The Buddha Amitabha, it is recorded in the sutras, created a "pure land" of his own and welcomes thither all men and women who trust him, "think of him with serene thoughts," and repeat his holy name a number of times. Here is an embodiment of an idea in Mahayana Buddhism that is dangerously near to the Christian conception of vicarious atonement, and it is little wonder that the sect (or sects) which lays its chief stress on this idea of salvation by faith should be at present the most powerful or prosperous in Japan.

The resemblance of certain phases of Mahayana Buddhism to Christianity, however, is said to be more apparent than real, more superficial than fundamental. With regard to the "deification" of the founder of Buddhism, Dr. J. Takakusu, one of the foremost Japanese authorities on Mahayana Buddhism, says:—

> In view of his lofty ideals, there can be no question but that Buddha was a personage possessed of super-human character, the greatest and noblest man the world has ever produced. Nevertheless, no true Buddhist recognizes him as a divine creator, a divine arbiter of man's destiny or a divine administrator of justice.

In regard to the worship of

Maha Vairoçana and Amitabha he writes:

> There might be any number of such Buddhas as Dainichi or Amida, but they were all different Buddhas, who were originally human beings and who later attained Buddhahood. And as a matter of fact, Buddhism has no other such representative Buddhas as Dainichi and Amida, these two representative Buddhas being nothing more or less than objective expressions of ideals possessed by Buddha in his mind. In short both of them are idealized Buddhas.

The statement, or rather admission, that Amitabha and Maha Vairoçana are merely "objective expressions" of the Buddha's ideals, may be found greatly disconcerting to those who would sincerely believe in them as their saviours (using "saviour" not necessarily in the usual Christian sense but in the more Buddhistic sense of one who *helps* others to save themselves). How can a Buddha who never really existed save mankind? Is it not a sort of superstition to believe in the existence of a being who never walked the earth? These queries raise problems of reality, existence, belief, etc. which cannot be disposed of in a short essay like this. Let me say, however, that the day is far gone by when men who were regarded as the foremost thinkers of their time refused to admit the existence of any but tangible things and imagined material existence to be the only form of reality.

We should remember, further, that Mahayana Buddhism itself clearly recognizes the great truth that it is our own minds that create the Buddhas. Nay, it goes further and reminds us that every man makes his own world. At a time when the tendency of philosophic thought in the west is clearly towards subjectivism, this Mahayanic idea of each man creating his own world should make a strong appeal to the thoughtful westerner.

But Buddhism, whether Mahayanic or Hinayanic, never confines itself to the subjective viewpoint. In his daily life the devout follower of the Amitabha sects in Japan reverences Amitabha with as much devotion as, or with even greater devotion than, his fellow Buddhist does the Buddha Sakyamuni himself. For him Amitabha actually lives in his Western Paradise, and the descriptions of Pure Land in the sutras are literal truths.

But why should Europeans, who have had a form of religion in some ways resembling the Amitabha sects of Buddhism, abandon their old faith and turn Buddhists. This query is answered partly by the quotation from the British friend's letter at the beginning of this article. They want a religion whose doctrines are "reasonable and attractive from an intellectual point of view". The tenets of even the most emotional Buddhist sects in Japan are based upon those great fundamental principles of Buddhism which are one and all the products of supreme intellect, or the wisdom of the Buddha.

M. G. MORI

THE GOOD LIFE

CONFLICT OF MORALS—OLD AND MODERN

[**Dr. Paul E. Johnson**, Professor of Philosophy at Hamline University (St. Paul, Minnesota) wrote in our June (1930) number on "Will West meet East?"—an article much talked about. In the present contribution he presents several Theosophical ideas and touches upon the power of Desire, which philosophers and moralists ask us to transmute, and yet without which unfoldment of human consciousness never is possible. In Eastern Esotericism the higher desires, which in and by themselves enable one to rise above earthly cravings, are three: (1) desire for the Spirit—Atman; (2) desire for the Knowledge of the Self—Brahma-Vidya or Theosophy; and (3) desire for the Fellowship of Holy Men—Sat-Sang, Good Company.—EDS.]

The good life is the chief concern of all who live. For this have men fought and found it not in strife, or toiled and lost it in fatigue. Of this have seers dreamed and declared it more than dream. In every form and circumstance life seeks to better its condition. This fact will be denied. The petulant may not want to be good, the lavish to have goods, nor the cynical to hope for good. And yet by some other name or route each goes in search of what he desires because it seems to him good. Even the ascetic who rejects desire and scorns his present life does so in hope of one that shall be better. So for better or for worse, life is ever pursuit of the good.

Pursuit of the good, in fact, is virtually inescapable. Long before moral questions come to conscious issue, life is everywhere so engaged. Elementary forms of life strive always toward what biologists call "the optimal condition," meaning that condition which is best for the organism. In the give and take of experience, all living things learn to improve their behaviour. By inherited tendency or acquired character life is loaded in the direction of the good. And when in the conscious level man begins to reason, there can be no doubt that his ingenuity gropes with the practical problem of bettering his present circumstance. Or if he turns from the practical to the more remote, he pictures a golden age or some future state of blessedness. And as the interests of family and tribe crystallize into custom and moral code, the aim is still to conserve the good.

It is of course evident that men do not agree on what is good. A sweeping glance across the boundaries of civilizations reveals disparities at every turn. It has been suggested that no vice has ever been condemned which at some time has not been praised as a virtue. By such contrasts we are encouraged here to question moral authorities, there to despair altogether of human efforts to know the good. Both problems deserve a hearing.

The comparative study of moral

codes has ventilated not a little our thinking on moral authority. To comprehend the social basis of morality unloads somewhat the exclusive claim to individual authority, whether human or divine. To find other groups as earnest about their moral customs as we are over ours may result in questioning the assumption that ours is the only morality. To see people living well under other moral standards may cause us to doubt that we are all right and the rest all wrong. When authorities disagree, who shall judge among them? When morals stand in conflict, who shall settle the dispute? If there are so many honest, yet contradictory opinions of the good, was Shakespeare right that there is nothing good or bad but thinking makes it so?

Here the question of moral authority gives way to the question of moral knowledge. Whoever knows the good may be his own authority, but if the good cannot be known how shall we trust any authority? When there is added to conflicts among ancient morals the widespread confusion in our present-day morality, the situation becomes serious indeed. Is there no certainty anywhere? Must men give up all hope of knowing the good as vain conceit? Caution may here be the better part of valour. Whatever the claims to certainty or knowledge, they should at any rate be critically examined.

Let each man concerned in finding the good begin with his own experience. There is no one so unfortunate as to be denied some experience of good. To live at all is to experience certain goods, enough at least to keep alive. To live in the complex conditions of modern human society may consist of more goods than one can use, assimilate or even number. So whatever experience of good a life may possess, let us begin here and undertake to analyse. It might require more time and patience than we have to list in detail the goods of any life from food, shelter, and necessities of health to work, play, friendship and beauty. What we are looking for is that essential to all particular experiences of good. Is there nothing common to all enjoyment of the goods of life?

Yes, there is, and perhaps we have already stumbled upon it. For in asking if there is nothing common to all enjoyment of the goods of life, we have an answer before us in the very asking of the question. What is common to all is the *enjoyment* of something. In all experiences we call good, there is some satisfaction enjoyed. Even physical pain, as inflicted by the ascetic upon himself or endured by the faithful in discharging his duty, may be enjoyed. This coincidence of satisfaction with every good has led many to conclude that the good is happiness, and none other. In some quarters, happiness is seen as mere quantity of pleasure; in others, the quality of the satisfaction is what the good demands. It is even urged that happiness or pleasant feeling is so overpowering a motive that it is the only end life is able to choose.

Evidently we have come upon an important element common to all experiences approved as good. But it is a half-truth to take a pleasant feeling as the whole of any good. A good feeling is part of the realization of every good, but only a part. A grin without a face is quite as probable as that pleasure is the good. For pleasure and pain are symptoms, like bodily temperature, of organic conditions, good or bad. Satisfaction is not an abstract emotion or detached nervous thrill. Something must be satisfied, and that something is organic need. Something must be accomplished, and that something is the well-being that makes life good.

From the standpoint of human life, therefore, the good is that which adequately fulfils human need. We call that evil which betrays human life, degrades or destroys it. Disease is evil in that it brings us to decay and destruction. Deceit is evil in that it brings us to error and misunderstanding. But health is good because it enables us to exercise our normal powers, and honesty is good because it leads us to truth and appropriate action in the light of the truth. As each organ has its own function to perform, so every man has his own end or aim to fulfil. That is to say that the whole life of a man is meant for something, to do and to be in certain ways that will fulfil the law of his being. This end or aim of every life is its particular good, (as Socrates would say) and only conduct organized to that end is good conduct. The good is that which satisfies our needs in the most effective way, thus becoming at once the end and means of our best development.

We must not be deceived, however, by the double use of the word "end". One use (the most common in fact) employs "end" to mean final, closed, after which there is none other, as when in reading a story we come to the last page and close the book. The other use (the one we have been employing) signifies the aim or purpose of behaviour, the goal towards which one is striving, or function one endeavours to fulfil. Now the sense in which we have been using this second meaning excludes the finality of the first meaning. The good which constitutes the end of our conduct is endless. It must not be closed or finished else it betrays life, and is no longer good. For life is a growing thing, and whatever meets life's need must also grow. It might also be said that the end or aim of life is growth. At least life's good is a growing good. The child's arm or leg that fails to grow is useless and worse. The mentality that fails to grow is imbecile. Arrested development is life defeated.

So we may add to our former statement this—the good is that which develops and enlarges human needs. In fact this is the only way that our needs can be adequately fulfilled. For the ful-

filment of growth is exactly the enlarging of capacities, the development of new and higher needs. The needs of so advanced an animal as the ape are very few. But the arrival of man brings a whole range of new interests and wants, while each advance in civilization is the outcome of fresh demands and larger appreciations. It is no service to a child to fixate his affection upon the parent to the exclusion of younger friends. It is no good to a society to crystallize loyalty around old traditions to the exclusion of newer ideals and ambitions. For in this over-anxiety to conserve past good comes arrested development and stunted progress. The good must not be enemy to the better, but demonstrate its saviourhood by saving not itself. To shatter old contentments, to add new wants to the former ones, to create larger demands and develop new hungers is essential to any adequate fulfilment of human needs.

> Then welcome each rebuff
> That turns earth's smoothness rough
> That bids nor sit nor stand but go!

The urge to go is hot upon us in this western hemisphere. Our nerves are set for action and it is not hard to convince ourselves that we ought to go somewhere. But in all our going we are apt to miss growing. When we view evolution as a thin line of advance, and think of progress as a forward march, we are almost sure to invite the illusion of growth in linear terms. We frequently speak of progress as "pushing on" and development as "getting ahead". But the quality of life is not to be measured by tape-lines or even foot-pounds. The expansion of life-capacities is more subtle than our most refined measurements. Mere size means nothing, for the most delicate organs are often the most minute. In structure, it is proportion; and in behaviour, it is co-ordination that counts. The mileage covered, the distance gained is beside the point, and it is often in this way that we defeat ourselves. For in getting ahead, we get askew and let fall behind at other vital points. By overreaching ourselves, we lose our balance and crash.

The end of all life is harmonious completion. And by this we do not mean the completion of a final end, but completion of endless fulfilment. Maturity is the completion of adolescence, just as adolescence is of childhood, but neither is normally the finish. Each development completes or fulfils the previous beginnings and goes on to the next. And the good life consists in harmonious completion. It is balanced, well-proportioned, and co-ordinated. It is complete in all human values. Success, as we popularly acclaim it, is often a mockery upon the good life. For the so-called successful man is usually one who has "gotten ahead" in some specialized task to the neglect of life's other values. The man who makes a million dollars and fails to buy culture with them, the woman who wins a career and wrecks a home, the artist who loves beauty and despises his fellowman, the social worker who serves the poor and neglects her health, are typical examples of empty successes. The unbalanced life often passes for the good life, but in reality it is like the house built on sand.

Who then is good? There was a teacher whom men have for twenty centuries called good, who when so addressed refused the honour, reserving it for the Divine Ideal, the goal of human striving. More recently an ardent idealist declared man in the vision of the superman a sore shame. The good life on our plane forever aims at completion and is never complete, strikes for harmony and plays often discord. The good institution, for example, the family, may be made in heaven (as our mothers and fathers believed) but the last disagreement or misunderstanding is not yet banished from the human home. The good civilization, whether tested in the discipline of ages or hopeful in the glow of early ambitions, is not yet perfect. In the light of the ideal, we all stand condemned as individuals, institutions or cultures. But there is no cause for despair. Human needs are growing restlessly, insatiably larger and larger, perhaps higher and higher. We want more than our fathers did. Too often these wants are childish and petulant or superficial and mistaken. But without wanting there is no having. It is difficult to see how even the Buddha could have enlightenment without wanting it. Desire is not always bad, any more than it is always good. Desires are bad that defeat human success in its true greatness. Desires are good that seek to fulfil human nature at its best. As hunger is the normal requisite to nourishment, so desire is prerequisite to growth.

If these impulsive and unruly human desires can be educated to seek only the best, their power will become effective goodness. Not by external control or the restraint of Plato's charioteer is progress most steadily won. Our hope lies rather in the control of inner poise, the clear-eyed patience that seeing visions eternal frets not that the road is long.

PAUL E. JOHNSON

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

WESTERN KNOWLEDGE *

[**Geoffrey West** contrasts Eastern and Western knowledge in this able review.—EDS.]

This is an important book. It can scarcely be reviewed, but it should be read as widely as possible, certainly by every would-be intelligent person. Inevitably it has omissions, yet it is not inadequate to its ambitious title if the special significance of "modern," and the essential limitation of "outline," are properly appreciated. Perhaps Western Knowledge would have been a better phrase, yet the knowledge of the East *is* primarily an Ancient Wisdom, and while Western knowledge looks back to Aristotle and to Protagoras who proclaimed man to be the measure of all things, still it is mainly in the last three hundred years that the great body of cumulative fact and theory specifically to be designated modern has come into being.

Within the covers of this book the principal departments of that knowledge are described, in twenty-four articles by twenty-two experts, in outline indeed but without essential omission *so far as they go*. The qualification is important, as will appear. Each article, on an average, consists of rather more than twenty thousand words, and with one or two exceptions each outlines the past history of its subject before embarking on an exposition of present views and their relation to the life and thought of to-day. Each is the work of a man sufficiently at home in his own field to achieve clarity without undue simplification. There is no condescension to the reader. Naturally the articles are not all of equal merit, but the best are altogether admirable—as Professor R. A. Sampson on Astronomy, Sir J. Arthur Thomson on Biology, Dr. F. Aveling on Psychology, Dr. R. R. Marett on Anthropology, Mr. G. D. H. Cole on Industrial Organisation, and again on Political Organisation, Dr. C. Delisle Burns on International Organisation, and Professor Lascelles Abercrombie on Literary Criticism—and even from those others most open to criticism a discriminating reader will learn much and continuously. With a full sense of the book's limitations, I would urge it as a valuable possession to both West and East. A world in which every one had read and assimilated it might not necessarily be a better world, but it would be a more hopeful one.

I at least, as a Westerner, cannot fail to be impressed by

*An Outline of Modern Knowledge. Edited by Dr. William Rose (Gollancz, 8s. 6d.)

the sheer achievement it records. Decry it as you wish—the achievement, that is—and still its aim, its ambition, remains magnificent. This knowledge is a human knowledge, built with human intellect from a human foundation. Starting, in effect, from little more than Descartes' bare affirmation, "I think, therefore I am," it has brought into being by brain and eyes and hands a surely marvellous vision of a coherent universe, in astronomy reaching out to unmeasured depths of time and space, in biology laying bare the physical, in psychology and psycho-analysis the mental and emotional, processes of organic being, in archæology and anthropology harking back to human beginnings, in history, economics and political science studying social organisation and development, in the arts revealing cultural growth, in physics analysing matter itself, and in philosophy questioning the nature of knowledge and even of reality. The scope and bulk and detail of the resultant knowledge, as set forth in these pages, seem to me to constitute an amazing feat of discovery and definition, so concrete in appearance that it is difficult to hold in mind the hypothetical, subjective nature of much of it. I cannot but salute it, even as I question it. At least it may be claimed for it that, after its own fashion, it works. In every sphere it has been applied with remarkable skill to give Western man his acknowledged material mastery, to win ever-increasing earthly riches, to give him not merely worldly dominion but understanding (of a kind) of land and sea and sky, of his past, his present, and his future.

Yet, in the face of that miracle, something seems radically wrong. Few things are clearer than the inability of the West to use its knowledge for concerted human good. It falls very far short of the reality to call Western man non-spiritual; mostly he simply does not know the meaning of the term. How apposite even to-day—perhaps more than ever to-day, though written nearly thirty years ago—is Mr. Lowes Dickinson's imaginary *Letters from a Chinese Official*, a small volume with which every student of East and West should be acquainted. The supposedly Chinese writer of these letters acknowledges the achievement of the West, but sees clearly that "the most brilliant discoveries, the most fruitful applications of inventive genius, do not of themselves suffice for the well-being of society". That is but too patent in the secular West, which having sold its soul for power, has given full freedom to uncontrolled political and economic forces, and in a single century has "dismantled your whole society".

> Property and marriage, religion, morality, distinctions of rank and class, all that is most important and profound in human relationships, has been torn from the roots and floats like wreckage down the stream of time. . . . . Your legislation for the past hundred years is a perpetual and fruitless effort to regulate the disorders of your economic system. . . . . You have dissolved all human and personal ties, and you endeavour, in vain, to replace them by the imper-

sonal activity of the State. The salient characteristic of your civilisation is its irresponsibility. You have liberated forces you cannot control; you are caught yourself in your own levers and cogs.

The indictment is only too true. Irresponsibility, lack of control—the Siamese-twin characteristics of Western civilisation, wombed in the blackness of utter lack of spiritual knowledge or purpose. Science, for all its probings, has no word, no light. Naturalistic, it begins at the bottom of the ladder with the simple secular fact of individual cognition, and works upward as best it may. It does not know where it is going; it moves forward blindly. Its foundation is, not man's divine character, but his identity with a world of nature from which divinity is expressly excluded. Rejecting the wisdom of those on higher planes, crying down their knowledge from above, necessarily it quarrels with religion. The power of unadulterated naturalism seemed at its greatest towards the end of the nineteenth century; it proclaimed a world of deterministic mechanism, wherein man was but one undistinguished cog. To-day the tide has receded a little. There is a reaction towards religion. Einstein has demolished some of that mechanistic basis, if without setting anything as solid in its place. Discoveries in physics too have seemed to lift a little the nightmare burden of absolute determinism, so that Mr. Sullivan can declare free will at least an equally valid hypothesis, and less cautious writers go a good deal farther. Even Dr. Rose, the editor of this volume, states: "The whole outlook has changed and is changing. The materialistic and mechanistic views of last century, encouraged and strengthened by the biological discoveries of Darwin, are giving place to speculations which are in danger of falling into the abyss of mysticism."

Such speculations, it would appear from these pages, are not to be regarded as in themselves scientific. The more general admission is rather that science, in stealing the thrones of philosophy and religion, has exceeded its function. Science, it is said, tells us only of structure, not nature, it is quantitative not qualitative, and, Mr. Sullivan suggests, "there is no real reason to suppose that everything science neglects is less real than what it accepts". Thenceforward one notes with increasing interest the manner in which this recognition of the extra-scientific realities is echoed in certain of these essays, especially those on Biology, Psychology, and Anthropology. A few sentences from the first of these, by Sir Arthur Thomson, stressing what he aptly terms Psycho-Biology, may well be quoted as indicating the wiser attitude of the liberal scientist:

It must be clearly understood that scientific naturalistic *description* does not imply what is called philosophical naturalism, which denies the validity of all transcendental or spiritual *interpretation*. For while science answers the questions *What?* *Whence?* and *How?* it never even asks the question *Why?* In other words, science does not raise the philosophical or religious question of the meaning, significance or purpose behind the world of the measurable... The biologist, as biologist, dredges in the sea of reality with nets of a certain kind of mesh (his biological methods) and is naturally restricted to the capture of certain kinds of fishes...If he has arranged the meshes of his net so that they will only catch metabolism, he cannot expect to discover Mind in his sea. None the less, he may be well aware of it, and thus become psycho-biologist.

He himself finds mind everywhere from the amœba upwards, and seems to regret the slowness of others to accept the psycho-biological point of view. Dr. Aveling, in dealing with Psychology, notes the evident swing "in contemporary thought from materialistic and physiological explanations of mental phenomena to spiritualistic and purely psychological ones". Dr. Marett on Anthropology is even more suggestive. Science, he agrees, is concerned with bare facts, not ultimate values. Yet from the bare facts of anthropology we cannot fail to draw conclusions of quantitative and qualitative progress. And even though scientifically we "are on firmer ground when we take stock of ourselves as evolved animals than as undeveloped angels," still it remains true that

as far back as we can trace him, Man appears a visionary who has lived on an overdraft and traded on credit. Since, therefore, something infinite attaching to his notion of good has hitherto helped him on his way, it might well seem sound policy on his part to continue steadfastly to imagine the divine, and to treat it as the only true measure of the human.

Surely here we see Western scientists reaching out in a wiser way towards understanding than in the staunchly naturalistic philosophic and scientific summaries of Professor Wolf, or in the Rev. W. R. Matthews' notably unsatisfying essay on "The Idea of God," which is all too evidently biased by a Christian belief. Yet one great difficulty remains inherent in the very bulk of the knowledge science has accumulated. Like its own drawing of the divergent evolutionary tree of life, it branches ever wider and wider at every stage of its analytic progress, each science detaching itself from the others and then dividing and sub-dividing within itself until even in the limited field of history Professor Hearnshaw looks forward apprehensively to a time when it will be impossible for any one man to bring all the new knowledge together and distil a coherent philosophy from it, and Dr. Rose, surveying the whole field, sees the prospect of a final universal synthesis growing ever more remote.

Yet synthesis—spiritual synthesis—there must be if the West is not to involve not only itself but the whole world in possibly irretrievable disaster. These tentative scientific liberalisms are not in themselves enough. The West is hungry for illumination, and if the "abyss of mysticism" into which Dr. Rose suggests it may fall is to be an uninstructed mysticism, then indeed it may prove the danger he suggests. It is one criticism of this book that it makes all too little attempt to fore-

stall that peril by providing, or pointing to, adequate instruction, though what it lacks is only what Western science as a whole does and must for some time continue to lack: a synthesis which will bring science back into relation with philosophy and religion, and strike a true balance and harmony between the spiritual and naturalistic, the Eastern and Western, approaches to knowledge. How that might be achieved would need an article, or a series of articles, even to suggest. Theosophists, however, will be unable not to regard it as significant that among the more than five thousand index entries which conclude the volume, neither Theosophy nor Mme. Blavatsky has even the barest reference.*

Promised an outline, it is perhaps unreasonable to complain that we are not given a synthesis, though one, surely, should be inherent in the other. The wise reader will learn from this book much, for he will not suppose that he is learning all. But indeed he would be a fool who took it for his scripture, and treated it as an end rather than as a beginning, and an ill-balanced beginning at that.

GEOFFREY WEST

MACHINERY AND THE SOUL OF MAN †

THE INDIAN POINT OF VIEW

[**R. M. Fox** is the author of *The Triumphant Machine* which attracted a great deal of attention in England and America. His first section on "Mass Production" in this book is used as a University Text-book on Industrialism in California and is listed as an authority on the subject. His latest volume *Drifting Men* deals with British Prison life as seen by a conscientious objector.

Mr. Fox is a contributor to *The Hibbert Journal, The Nineteenth Century, The Fortnightly Review* and other periodicals. At present he is engaged on the new Irish National Daily *The Irish Press.* His work has been "to write of the modern machine order from the standpoint of one who has spent several years as a factory worker".

He specialised on Industrial Psychology at Oxford and spent some months in Russia lecturing at the Far-Eastern University.—EDS.]

---

* Not quite. Theosophists from H. P. Blavatsky downwards have been aware that scientists have their own pride, prejudices and predilections, and that fanaticism is not the special weakness of the religionist only. They have also been aware that many of the most advanced truths of science are but echoes of ancient teachings to be found in literature from the time of the Hindu Vedas down to H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine*. Scientists can and do ignore Theosophy and H. P. Blavatsky but Karma smiles as year by year books of science proclaim as fresh and new that which was taught by her as old truth some fifty years ago. But ever is wisdom justified of her children.—EDS.

† *The Wheel of Fortune* by M. K. Gandhi.
On Khaddar by Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya (G. A. Natesan, Madras.)

No one can adequately discuss human society to-day without considering the place of the machine and its influence on men and women. Problems of unemployment, war and peace, national freedom, social stability and individual happiness are bound up with these iron monsters.

The machine age has brought with it all kinds of mechanistic standards and utilitarian judgments which constitute an ever-widening breach with older traditions. The difference between Western theorists of the nineteenth century —such as Robert Owen and Fourier—and the revolutionaries of to-day, is largely a matter of the industrial technique of the era. The French Revolution, emphasising liberty, equality and fraternity—for the individual—corresponds to a period of small workshops, skilled craftsmen, independent merchants. Nineteenth-century Britain produced its individualist thinkers—Adam Smith and Bentham—who gave the rising factory lords and merchants their battle cries. The Russian Revolution, with its mass conceptions, obliterating the individual corresponds to mass production which does the same.

Twentieth-century industry—in the West—is all-absorbing and all-pervading. Its belts and pulleys are the driving forces of busy towns and remote villages. Palaces and parliaments respond to the throb and whirr of its countless wheels. Increasingly it shapes our lives and settles our opinions. As men grow conscious of its force they accept it or resent it strongly, dividing themselves into camps for and against the machine.

The question of how far the machine may be used with advantage appears capable of clear practical demonstration. A solid, shining machine is hardly a matter of philosophic disputation. Once it is in motion it should put an end to all controversy. When we have seen its results we should surely be able to decide whether it is worth while or not. Yet the inexorable certainty of the machine—the logic of machine processes—has the effect of pushing out of the human consciousness all standards of judgment which do not fit in with machine calculations.

Machine standards are preeminently those of rapid production. The only effective difference between machines is that one works faster than another at lower running costs. People are now being judged by the same standard, their lives, hopes and happiness being regarded as quite irrelevant, matters which only a hopelessly impractical person would consider. The application of such machine standards to people indicates how far we have come under the sway of the machine idea and have allowed it to penetrate our souls. To the machine mind such characters as Joan of Arc, Terence MacSwiney or Gandhi are quite incomprehensible as too are those great gusts of national feeling which still sweep through the world.

Economic troubles are imper-

vious to machine logic because this is a foreshortened logic which stops short of real solutions. It takes no account of underlying human needs. The machine can turn out boots but it can give no guidance on what should be done with the boots. It will use up energy but can give no guidance as to when the mind and body of the human agent tending it require change, rest and refreshment. The machine is non-moral, non-intellectual, non-spiritual—in other words, it is mechanical. The chaos of the modern world is largely centred in the attempt to arrive at mechanical solutions of spiritual and human problems.

We are not faced with problems of production—in spite of what our wise men say—but with problems of greed. In this issue of nobility and fair-dealing versus villainy and over-reaching, machine calculations can have no place, for they never reach the real issue. Western mechanical thought is pitiful in its lack of depth, its cocksure shallowness of mind. Rattling on with a slick efficiency it never guesses that the real problems are beyond its reach. Sometimes it is suggested that the soul of the machine has overwhelmed the soul of man. But machine and soul belong to different, if not antithetical, spheres. It is true that the world is largely non-moral and non-intellectual in its economic relations because it has accepted machine limitations and bears the stamp of the machine.

In the East a counter-tendency rises—revealed in the writings of Gandhi—and attaining expression in his book *The Wheel of Fortune*. A critic, attacking his advocacy of hand-loom weaving, from a Western standpoint, writes:—

> The real question for consideration with us (in India) . . . is not whether the handloom will or will not be able to hold its own against the power loom . . . but which will contribute to the economic and political power of a nation.

Here we find the critic obsessed with the idea of power—a machine conception. Gandhi puts the other view:—

> It is not quite clear from the above what the notions of the correspondent are about the economic and political power of this country. We cannot imagine him to seriously believe—though his argument runs as if he does—that that power can be achieved without feeding and clothing the millions of our half-starving and half-naked men, women and children. The political and economic power of a nation depends even in this "age of mechanical industrialism" not on its powerful machines but on its powerful men.

Here the issue that we must all face is met squarely. The test of a system is what happiness, comfort and life it can offer to human beings. Gandhi explains that eighty per cent of India's population spend more than six months in the year in enforced idleness, in miserable poverty. The spinning wheel, simple and inexpensive, would provide them with food and occupation. When the power loom came in Britain in the nineteenth century, hand-loom weavers starved. No Gandhi urged his countrymen to

buy their goods. Instead economic thinkers assured the country that production must not be interfered with. "In the long run," they asserted, "the situation will right itself. Leave it to the machine!" So the handloom weavers starved because the chief consideration was to keep the machines running. It is the chief consideration to-day. Shall we have mechanical efficiency at the cost of human agony? The West says "Yes". Gandhi says "No". It is a question of the relative value of the machine and the human soul.

Reading a later booklet, *On Khaddar*, by Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya we learn the story of the forcible destruction of India's village industries. This natural expression of the life of the people was crushed out, leading to a general lowering of tone, to idleness and dissipation, in place of former pride in skill and happy craftsmanship. The revival of hand-spinning in India is not advocated purely as a means of providing food but also because it inculcates ideas of self-respect and skilful industry which help to make life happier and fuller. Without entering upon an examination of this it is sufficient to note that here, too, the well-being of the individual, material, mental and spiritual, holds first place. Where, in the West, are industrial developments put to a similar test?

The machine passed over India like a scythe over a field—even though it was operated from Lancashire. But the *On Khaddar* booklet shows the grass and flowers springing to life again through that invincible life impulse which is beyond the machine's reach. The destruction of village industries took the happiness out of Indian homes, bringing starvation and desolation of soul. With the hum of the spinning wheel, comfort, laughter and skill are returning to those homes. Gandhi writes of the spinning wheel:—

> I claim for it the properties of a musical instrument, for whilst a hungry and a naked woman will refuse to dance to the accompaniment of a piano, I have seen women beaming with joy to see the spinning wheel work, for they know that they can, through that rustic instrument, both feed and clothe themselves.

Again—from a Western standpoint—what interests me is the absence of a mechanical approach. Do we ever concern ourselves with the problem of whether a certain form of production means more happiness? We have only to ask the question to see how far we have drifted from human considerations in our present productive order.

Gandhi summarises his attitude in *The Message of the Charka* when he says:—

> It is my claim that as soon as we have completed the boycott of foreign cloth, we shall have evolved so far that we shall necessarily give up the present absurdities and remodel national life in keeping with the ideal of simplicity and domesticity implanted in the bosom of the masses. We will not then be dragged into an imperialism, which is built upon the exploitation of the weaker races of the earth and the acceptance of a giddy materialistic civilisation protected by naval and air forces that have made peaceful living almost impossible.

On the contrary we shall then refine that imperialism into a commonwealth of nations which will combine, if they do, for the purpose of giving their best to the world and of protecting, not by brute force but by self-suffering, the weaker nations or races of the world.

Here is the counter-stroke to the mechanical tendency, nothing less than an attempt from the East to restore nobility to the soul of man. Let it be understood that it is not the machine, as such, which is objected to, it is the glorification of the machine at the expense of humanity. It is a demand that the balance shall be restored. To rob the machine of its power for evil it must be stripped of its glamour and looked at simply as a thing of iron and steel to be used for definite limited ends. The truth about the machine is that it is neither good nor bad. Virtue or vice lies purely in its use or misuse. It has no standards to give humanity.

As mechanical contrivances are used more and more in the home we get a saner view of them. A woman at home is not dazzled by huge factories; roaring machines eating up metal and men; black chimneys pouring out smoke. The home idea of a machine is of a vacuum cleaner which may be used, without veneration, to save effort. So far in the factories the machine has not necessarily meant reduced effort for the operatives. Often it means increased effort, more drudgery and insecurity. If the use of a vacuum cleaner meant that a woman instead of cleaning so many square yards of carpet with a broom had to clean so many square miles with the vacuum cleaner, her brain might begin to reel. In the home the individual is always the centre but in the factory men have become tools.

Our growing dependence on machinery makes it difficult to understand the limitations of the machine. The machine enthusiasts shout too loudly. The machine pressure on our lives produces machine mysticism. The "Ford" conveyor system, where the motor car starts as a few pieces of metal and moves along accumulating parts till it is driven off at the other end with its own power, is our industrial civilization in miniature. We are all connected with those moving belts which determine how we shall work and how we shall spend our leisure. We dare not offend these metal monsters, by which we live, so we devise rationalisation schemes to keep them running whatever the human cost. We fail even to do this because we leave out of account the human side of the equation. Our lives are at the mercy of the changes the machines bring. They move forward like dread figures of Destiny inspiring feelings of devotion and awe. From such feelings comes the widespread conviction that the world must be planned on machine lines and that everything which does not fit in with the machine must go. Why should we keep the unemployed alive is the underlying unspoken question—they are not necessary to the machine! But it is necessary through all the confusion and conflict of industrial transition to keep a firm grip on those human values which alone give meaning to life.

Throughout the centuries and the seasons, the tree of Life has flowered. Its blossoms of genius, of art, of literature, like those of simple happiness, have not ceased to appear because of human folly. The deep-lying stream of tradition, welling from some hidden source, flows on, watering its roots. The machine is clamorous to-day because it has not found its place in the human scheme. We are not the only generation which has pushed its way up from those ancient roots. We are not the last. The machine will not stifle humanity. The soul of man will survive. The decision is not in our hands.

R. M. Fox

Science and Religion: *A Broadcast Symposium.* (Gerald Howe, Ltd., London. 4*s.* 6*d.*)

This is a symposium made from a series of broadcast talks by eminent scientists and religious leaders. Science bases its whole knowledge on three principles, *viz.* Uniformity, Continuity and Evolution. It regards Nature as a whole, a homogeneity, showing absence of caprice, presence of the inevitableness of consequence, of general trustworthiness, and, lastly, progress. This the leaders of religious thought in the west—who for nearly two thousand years have eliminated reason from the realm of religion and made men blind to the necessity of *true* religion—hail as the most "striking evidence of the steadfastness of the mind of God". To the students of Theosophy, the objection to the concept of an anthropomorphic God is that not only is it not true, but also that it is frivolous. With the exception of Prof. L. P. Jacks the speakers have said nothing on the "subject of soul evolution" or shown a Way of Life which every soul is capable of treading by self-discipline, self-examination, self-control and self-energization. Thus there is little guidance given for the attainment of *real knowledge.*

Not till Science and Religion recognise and accept the fundamental principles of Archaic Wisdom, which have the strength of universality, consistency and constancy, will there be any understanding between them. H. P. Blavatsky gives these principles in *Isis Unveiled*, II, p. 124.

1. Everything existing, exists from natural causes.

2. Virtue brings its own reward, and vice and sin their own punishment.

3. The state of man in this world is probationary.

We might add that on these three principles rested the universal foundation of every religious creed.

A study of ancient Theosophy which is an elaboration of these fundamentals will give a true and correct answer to the "tragic agnosticism" of Prof. Malinowski and to any scientific problems or religious questions.

B. Sc.

Raja-Yoga or Occultism. By H. P. BLAVATSKY (The Theosophy Company [India], Ltd., 51 Esplanade Road, Bombay.)

It was a happy thought which inspired the gathering together into a handy little volume a selection of twelve of those half-forgotten but vital essays of Madame Blavatsky, which hold an appeal rather for "the few" than for those whose interest in Theosophy is of a more academical character. The publishers of THE ARYAN PATH, in making available this collection, have rendered signal service to those more ardent souls for whom Theosophy means something more than arid philosophical speculation upon the origin and nature of the cosmos, and kindred forms of intellectual gymnastics. Not, be it understood, that these are without their value; for, after all, as the sun is reflected within the humble dewdrop, so, in man, the microcosm, is reflected every aspect of the eternal macrocosm. Where the spiritually unilluminated intellect alone succeeds in building a philosophical edifice in which it is liable to fall a victim to the mistake of worshipping the shadow of itself as it is cast upon the walls of its prison-house, those nobler souls, in whom are found united a keen intelligence with a glowing love of the Eternal, discover, beyond the limits of the separated self, however intellectually refined, the boundless spiritual Ether in which alone the untrammelled Spirit has its home.

How different is the true Occultism of H. P. B. from the popular conception may be gauged from what is perhaps the most notable essay here reprinted—that entitled *Occultism v. the Occult Arts*—in which it is stated that "True Occultism is the 'great renunciation of self,' unconditionally and absolutely, in thought as in action." Renunciation! Sacrifice! No promise of power! Is the prospect too repellent? Not for those who "open their souls to the Eternal," and, in Its light and warmth, unfold with the unconscious beauty of the flower.

As the anonymous writer of the able and illuminative preface to this little work points out: "Most students of Theosophy are not ready to practise this true Occultism, but all are in a position theoretically to study the problems connected with the Divine Science." Let them take to heart the warning given by H. P. B. in her essay on *Chelas and Lay Chelas*, in connection with the hidden perils of the Path. "We call to mind several sad failures within a twelvemonth," she writes; and the enumeration of the instances indeed brings home the conviction of the reality of the struggle in which the aspirant must inevitably find himself at one time or other involved. It may be deferred, but ultimately may not be evaded.

Again, in *Practical Occultism*, reprinted from *Lucifer* of May, 1888, the stringent requirements attending the status of "accepted chela" are outlined, with the result that the impossibility in the present conditions of Western civilization of becoming anything but a "lay chela" is forcibly brought home to the mind. Little wonder that the essay called forth correspondence from despairing aspirants to adeptship! Some comments of H. P. B. upon these letters have also been included, increasing considerably the value of the article itself. "One may study with profit the Occult Sciences," Madame Blavatsky remarks on one occasion, "without rushing into the higher Occultism"—in which connection another sentence equally pertinent may with advantage here be quoted:

> If one cannot, owing to circumstances of his position in life, become a full adept in this existence, let him prepare his mental luggage for the next, so as to be ready at the first call when he is once more reborn.

It is the incapacity to take the longer view which reveals the average inquirer as not yet ready to undertake the serious study of true Occultism. In the vast sweep of the evolutionary cycle, involving many incarnations before the task of spiritual unfoldment is completed, what is the relative value or importance of the karma of one short life? The intuition to perceive the fact that the circumstances of life are the result of no arbitrary providence, but are as inevitably attached to ourselves as is our physical shadow, and in no way to be got rid of until that which casts the shadow is lost in the light of the Spirit, is one of the most valuable qualities which can be brought to bear upon that greatest of all problems—the problem of conquering one's own "human nature". This, in the long run, each man must do for himself. There is nothing under heaven, "nothing that is out of the Eternal," which can do it for him. "The path winds uphill all the way." There is no easy road—nothing to be had which has not been *earned*. It is impossible at this point to forbear from quoting further from the valuable preface to this volume:

> There are students, now as in the earlier days of the Movement, who are the victims of their own enthusiasm of ignorance. They are susceptible to the blandishments of the short and easy path. They fall prey to the promise of quick results made to them. They are practitioners of the ignoble art of getting something for nothing. They are ready to rush headlong into the laboratory of Nature's arcanum, lay hold on any of her secret apparatus, swallow at a gulp any prescription offered. The price they have paid for entrance is a frightful one—the sacrifice of their commonsense. The price to be paid is still more terrible—the sacrifice and loss of the evolution of the Soul. Fools still rush in where angels fear to tread, never counting the cost, as though their refusal to count made the reckoning less.

Would it were possible to notice seriatim the essays chosen with so much discrimination; but that is not possible. Old friends many of them are, awakening memories of what instinctively one designates as "the good old days". In the article entitled *What of Phenomena?* one is reminded of the discussion which raged among members of the T.S. around the "manifestations" of H.P.B. *Psychic and Nöetic Action* which first appeared in October and November 1890 is an invaluable essay for the serious student; while in the dialogue between H. P. B. and Mabel Collins, at the time co-editor of *Lucifer*, abound many helpful hints for those who care to ponder them. Running, however, through the entire collection, like the theme of a musical composition, is the exhortation that the enquirer should study the philosophy of occultism before attempting the task of practical training.

For those who consider sympathetically the hints and warnings conveyed in the course of these twelve articles, instruction and illumination are available in a degree proportionate to the sincerity of the student. Armed with the knowledge of what constitutes true occultism, the sincere Theosophist should find it possible to avoid many pitfalls, and what better counsel could he have than that of H.P.B. herself? In the guise of Occultism any practices of a psychic nature are advocated as a sure and ready means of "obtaining results". Where these are not actually harmful to the unwary student who personally applies them, they are at least misleading and, from the spiritual point of view, a waste of time. With a guide such as that afforded by the counsel of H.P.B. it should be possible for every student to discriminate unerringly between the psychic and the spiritual. Indeed the writer of the Preface to this work makes no vain boast in claiming that "every article in this volume contains priceless instruction". To those who approach the subject in the proper frame of mind *Raja-Yoga or Occultism* is rich in spiritual wealth—and spiritual wealth is beyond all price.

HENRY J. STRUTTON

[Our reviewer is the editor of the well-known *Occult Review*.—EDS.]

Prometheus and Epimetheus, A Prose Epic. By CARL SPITTELER, translated by James F. Muirhead, M. A., L. H. D. (Jarrolds, London.)

The legend of Prometheus is the grandest of ancient myths. Its origin in the East, the appeal it has consistently made through the ages, and the nobility of thought and language it has produced, from Æschylus to Shelley, emphasise its supreme significance. Carl Spitteler, the German-Swiss epic poet,

who died in 1924, so felt the force of the Promethean myth that he used it as the theme of his first and last major works, despite the interval of nearly forty-five years. *Prometheus and Epimetheus*, a long prose poem, is the earlier of these two, and it is not too much to say that it alone must place Spitteler on an equal footing with the greatest authors whom the legend has inspired. It has been truly said that Spitteler is the greatest epic poet since Milton.

The inner meaning of the story of Prometheus is, of course, the winning for Man of the divine fire from Heaven, giving him spiritual perceptions and enabling him to be the master of his own evolution. It is finely described by H. P. Blavatsky—who in *The Secret Doctrine* (Vol. II. pp. 411–422) has given us the most comprehensive and reliable analysis of the Promethean myth—as pointing to "the last of the mysteries of cyclic transformations, . . . from the ethereal to the solid physical state, from spiritual to physiological procreation" (*S. D.* II. 415); and she further clarifies its import by the following:—"The Host that incarnated in a portion of humanity. . . . . preferred free-will to passive slavery, intellectual self-conscious pain and even torture. . . . . to inane, imbecile, instinctual beatitude." (*S. D.* II. 421.) The torments of Prometheus are in himself, and are the consequences of his own spiritual independence.

Spitteler the philosopher is deeply conscious of the vital significance of his theme, but he speaks only through Spitteler the poet. The beauty of word images, the entrancing flow of the epical story, have the quality and enchantment that only true poetry can offer; but for the reader who sees beneath symbols there is rich philosophy waiting to be plucked by the wayside. Spitteler symbolises and personifies everything. A cloud talks with its shadow, a worm of regret crawls at midnight out of the dark grave, the lion of pride is Prometheus's boon comrade. His thoughts are insects which, when they notice his slackened will, begin to whizz and buzz about him, blustering and shrilling in a hateful and hundred-voiced song. Pandora's treasure is now a child, now a jewel, now a kind of animal. Spitteler's mind is so truly poetical that it leaps to the image first, and to the feeling or act it personifies only second. And, as Spitteler himself said, "If you find these scenes beautiful you have understood them."

One brief sample of his style must be quoted. It tells of the last of Pandora's treasure, which the race of men have discarded as hateful rubbish beneath a bush:

> And now the whole countryside was empty and lonely, while the birds twittered dreamily in the trees. And the only face to be seen in the whole round ball of the world was that of the Sun, who, with half-closed eyes, was dozing on the soft rug of his chariot, in order to refresh his graceful limbs. And, the while, his noble horses jogged along through the hot and shadeless ether.
>
> Then a boy appeared, crawling slowly over the brown fields, plodding with effort over the low furrows, because his footsteps were stained with red blood.
>
> Yet he uttered no complaint and shed no tears. But when, after a long and painful hour, he reached the low bush beneath the apple tree,
>
> He threw himself passionately on the ground, crying and sobbing, like one who has lost the whole world, like one in whose heart a nameless chord has snapped.

The enjoyment of fine lyrical or epic poetry, especially from a poet who deserves a wide public through translation for English-speaking peoples, is enormously increased when it has an inner meaning apparent to the thoughtful. The present translation will enable many who perhaps know the Promethean myth well only from its analysis in *The Secret Doctrine* to see it set forth in all the fullness and force of its human message, perhaps with occasional irony, yet in the guise of splendid, heart-stirring, biblical language—undoubtedly the finest epic poetry of these latter years.

G. W. W.

From Orpheus to Paul. By VITTORIO D. MACCHIORO (Henry Holt and Company, New York. $ 3.00)

This book deals with the history of Orphism, and contains the Schermerhorn Lectures in Religion delivered by the author during the winter of 1929 at Columbia University. As a curator of the Royal Museum of Naples and a professor in the University of Naples, and as one who has lived for many years among the historic relics of the Orphic cults, Dr. Macchioro is eminently qualified to give an account of that important phase of Greek mysticism which is so often misunderstood and misinterpreted. The main thesis of the author centres round two fundamental ideas, namely, the primitive character and the distinctiveness of the Orphic cult. Hence the first five chapters of the book are devoted to a discussion of the principal features of Orphism, such as the collective ecstasy, the collective communion, the spiritual rebirth etc., as evidences of their origin in primitive mentality. The next four chapters contain a clear presentation of the distinctive traits of the sect. Dr. Macchioro takes his reader through the three important stages in the conquest of Greece by this Orphic cult. While the early struggles of Orphism against the Greek State religion, its endeavours to gain control of Greek culture and the methods it adopted to carry the fight to its final success mark the first period, its career of conquests,—cultural and religious,—and its contribution to the Pythagorean, Heraclitean and Platonic philosophies, characterize the second period of its history. And finally, the reader is taken through the third period where he becomes familiar with the part played by Orphism in the making of Paulinism and the contributions made by it to the success of Christianity in southern Europe.

While each chapter has its distinctive historical value, the most attractive part of the book is the author's defence of his position that Orphism, far from being a constructive element in the history of Greek religion, was, in fact, an unconscious foe of the religion of the Greeks, in that it was thoroughly alien to the spirit and genius of the people. This is contrary to the view that the history of Orphism is merely an aspect of Greek thought. In support of his position that Orphism is a separate cult which originally stood in sharp opposition to the classic religion of the Greeks, the author first seeks to prove that Orphism is alien to Greek thought by tracing its origin to an outside source. From the point of view of their origins, religions may be divided into two great categories: natural or spontaneous religions and doctrinal or revealed religions. Religions which have had a natural growth, such as fetishism, animism, polytheism, belong to the first group. And such religions as Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, which have been founded by a historical person, fall under the second class. The latter differs from the former in three important respects. In the first place, a revealed religion has a founder; secondly, it possesses a sacred book; and thirdly it has an accepted system of theology. Inasmuch as Orphism possesses all these three essentials, the author maintains that it naturally falls under the class of doctrinal or revealed religions. It is significant that these three essentials are conspicuous by their absence in all Greek religions. The religion of the Greek has no founder, no source book of authority and no system of dogmas.

A study of the history of Orphism from this point of view leads the author to the conclusion that it was a religion whose origin, beliefs and history had nothing whatever in common with Greek religions. In fact, his investigation forces him to maintain that the whole history of Orphism points to something quite foreign to the Greek genius. If Orphism was so alien to the Greek outlook on religion and yet exerted so profound an influence on Greek thought, it is then pertinent to ask: Where did this cult come from? Whether the answer to this question offered by the author would satisfy a critical mind or not, it must be said to the credit of Dr. Macchioro that he does make an effort to find a way

out. First he is led to assume that Orphism was a primitive or ecstatic religion founded by some shaman or medicine man, whom later tradition named Orpheus. His assumption seems to be based on some resemblances which obtain between the ghost religion and Orphism. However, the high code of morals involved does not let him rest there in peace. Dr. Macchioro is therefore led to wonder next if the cult could not be better compared with primitive Judaism. Not finding even this quite satisfactory, he seeks an explanation in the close connection of Orphism with the worship of Dionysus. Like Orphism, the Dionysiac religion also was alien to Greek habits of mind. While this religion, for instance, claims immortality for the human soul, the Homeric eschatology denies it. It is no wonder then if the Homeric poems regarded this cult of Dionysus as a foreign religion not congenial to Greek society. Since ecstasy and frenzy which, though unknown to the Homeric religion, were customary in Thrace, it seems natural to the author that a Thracian origin should be attributed to the Dionysiac religion. And from the fact that Orphism was closely connected with this religion, Dr. Macchioro concludes that not only Orphism and its founder were not at all Greek but that they most probably were of Thracian origin.

That the Orphic cult is alien to Greek genius is admitted on all hands, but the author while he seeks to find its source of origin by tracing its primitive traits, does not, it seems to me, make a serious effort to discover its genesis by tracing its philosophical and theological characteristics to the sources of their origin. He does, of course, devote a whole chapter to a discussion of the influence of Orphism on Greek philosophy but in tracing their relationship he does not seem to go far enough. For instance, the author denies that Orphism and Pythagoreanism are one and the same thing, but admits that there is a real identity between them in regard to certain religious beliefs. Many Western scholars now admit that a great similarity exists between the Pythagorean philosophy and Indian wisdom. If Orphism is like Pythagoreanism in some of its features, then may not these common characteristics be due to a common source,—influences from India? It is this aspect of the question that is left altogether untouched in the research work of the author. The system of Orpheus is a system of the purest morality. And its teachings, such as severe asceticism, voluntary poverty, and justification by sacrifices and incantations were certainly at variance with the Greek way of life. Further, this sect believed not only in the eternity, immortality and divinity but also in the transmigration of souls. Moreover, it is interesting to note that the Orphic Brotherhood abstained from animal food, wore white linen garments and had many ceremonies and practices similar to those of some religious sects in India. It seems extraordinary that these striking features and peculiar ways of the sect,—so unlike the Semitic or Hellenic but so like those of the sects of India,—did not suggest to the learned professor the possibility of an Indian origin of the Orphic cult. Since Orphism had its origin about 600 B. C.,—the very period when the Ionian philosophers were so considerably influenced by Indian thought and life,—one wonders whether an investigation in that direction as to the origin of the Orphic cult would not be more fruitful. If the author had carried his research a little further and explored Indian sources, his work, I am inclined to believe, might have been a valuable contribution to the study of Comparative Religion.

JAGADISAN M. KUMARAPPA

The Holy Kabbalah. By A. E. WAITE. (Williams & Norgate, Ltd., London. 30s.)

One's first impression on receiving this large well-produced volume is that of pleasant surprise that Mr. Waite—student of religion, mysticism, masonry, magic, and hidden lore and legend—should have yet another big volume to offer to the world after nearly half a century of research, and the publication of something like the same number of volumes. It was in 1886 that *Mysteries of Magic* was published, to become, for many years, a kind of standing dish among the wide, and widely scattered, circle of readers who were, some seriously, others curiously, inquiring into the strange philosophy, or speculation, or religion that was first discussed in London drawing-rooms and Indian bungalows under the name of Esoteric Buddhism. Mr. Waite has travelled far since those days, adventured into many arid places and some mayavic swamps, but he has kept the goal ever in view and the results of his quests have enriched many private and public libraries with material valuable to posterity, as well as to his contemporaries for whom he has cleared and straightened up a good many jungles of literary superstition and legend.

In some sense it may be said he has ploughed a lonely furrow. He has never been a prominent figure of the coterie or the platform; he has never had a gospel to preach for he is essentially the mystic—not of the emotional type, his critical faculty is too well developed for that—and in the book now before us there lies ample demonstration of the fact in the revision and modification of statements and judgments which found place in the two earlier works, now out of print, which for all practical purposes have been re-issued in this volume. These are *The Doctrine and Literature of the Kabbalah* and *The Secret Doctrine in Israel*: the first dates from 1902 and the other from 1913, and Mr. Waite has in the interval traversed other fields of investigation but returns to Jewish Mysticism, as to an old love, in the conviction that herein is to be traced one important channel of the mystical tradition from early human history that is of vital interest to the true theosophist. Mr. Waite believes in a Secret Doctrine of Religion. His anxiety is to refine the gold of truth from the dross of superstition. "If," he writes, "I have had in the course of inquiry to reduce various illusions to their proper place in the realm of the fantastic, and have contracted the sphere of what is called Mysticism within its proper dimensions, I shall be justified as far as regards my intention by those whom I have sought to disabuse."

The work is addressed then not to Jewry, nor primarily as a contribution to scholarship, though it fills an important gap in the literature of Kabbalism in England, but rather it is part of a larger scheme, long resolved by the author, for an exploration of the traces of the Secret Tradition in Christian times and the determination of the vital question of the existence of a real Science of the Soul which can be freed from veilings and accretions and be recognisable as of the nature of the same quest as that of Catholic Mysticism. So then he finds that at their best and highest the "Sons of the Doctrine"—the old Kabbalists—were not without an inward realisation of a great reality, which they expressed outwardly as the "Bond of Union". If this reality exists the question of the age of records—the antiquity of Kabbalistic tradition—is only of consequence historically. Fundamentally if the truth is there it matters not if it be hoary with 700 or 7000 years.

The range of the work now under review embodies not only the material of the two books already named but also revisions and additions such as we should anticipate as the result of further research and consideration. The plan divides the volume into twelve books of which the first four treat of the literature of the Kabbalah and its history; the fifth to the eighth books embody the doctrine in respect of *God and the Universe; Spiritual hierarchies; the ways of God with man*, following the Old Testament tradition; and the *Higher Secret Doctrine*, which divides into

the *Mystery of Shekinah* and the *Mystery of Sex*. The ninth and tenth books revert to the "written word"—the first dealing with the medieval expositors and commentators on the Zohar; the second with some Christian students of the Kabbalah—a selection ranging from Raymond Lully to Eliphas Lévi and the modern French School. This division includes two short sections treating respectively of the Kabbalah and Esoteric Christianity, or, in other words, Anna Kingsford's well-known book *The Perfect Way*—and of the Kabbalah and Modern Theosophy. It may be conceived that to both these sub-sections some readers of THE ARYAN PATH will turn with special interest: whether they will be pleased or repelled by Mr. Waite's restrained but somewhat pointed criticisms depends in part on their own preconceptions, or cherished beliefs, and in part on their types of mind—but they should be read and weighed in the light of the motto which graces the title-page of Mme. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* "Satyât nâsti paro Dharmah," and possibly the conclusion will be that Mr. Waite might also have been justified in adopting for *his* title-page Montaigne's "Cecy est un livre de bonne Foy." which appears on that of *Isis Unveiled*.

Book eleven treats of the Kabbalah and other channels of Secret Tradition and one has only to recite the titles of its six sub-divisions—*i.e.*, the Kabbalah and Magic; Alchemy; Astrology; Free-Masonry; the Tarot and Mysticism—to excite the interest of many of our readers. Lastly, book twelve embodies some "final considerations" such as the developments of later Kabbalism, which is a return to literary criticism, and the alleged Christian elements of which, at some length, Mr. Waite disposes, as we think, effectually.

Summing up in a conclusion on Jewish Theosophy, Mr. Waite reverts to the subject matter of book eight. That no misunderstanding may be due to misapprehension on the part of the reviewer, here is the Author's own "argument" introducing this section:—

> The Secret Doctrine of the Zohar concerning the Holy Shekinah is the Mystery of Sex at its highest and she herself is the Mystery of the Oral Law. It is intimated that behind this Mystery there appears to be an authentic doctrine of Knowledge, based on experience. We are led on in this manner to a more particular study of the Mystery of Sex in the light of the Secret Tradition, and there is a sense in which it is still a study of Shekinah. It is suggested that there is or may be a Mystery of Human Nuptials behind it which has not been conceived by the heart of man in ordinary ways of life.

And in his conclusion Mr. Waite writes:—

> But I do believe that in the expounded Mystery of Sex—so far as it is indeed expounded—it suggests a great experiment which—"once in time and somewhere in the world"—may have been practised . . . It follows in fine therefore that SEPHER HA ZOHAR, the BOOK OF SPLENDOUR, has something to tell us at this day which calls to be heard by those who have ears. God preventing, I do not affirm that it offers an only way, since ways are many to the height. From the beginning of things He has called men and women in all the states of life, in childhood and virginity, in espousals and widowhood; and He who makes all things one has called the Lover and the Beloved, that they may go up hand in hand and become one in Him.

The Secret Doctrine of Israel is not milk for babes. Mr. Waite comparing it with the literature of Alchemy, of the Holy Graal, of Rosicrucianism and of speculative Masonry finds its distinctive characteristic in the fact that it concerns a mystery of sex summarised as the mystical body of Shekinah, while it includes the shadows and outlines of a science of perfection, and that it is "in living concurrence with the other witnesses". Amid all the degradation which has come to surround that central fact of humanity's existence as a race it is not an easy task to adumbrate for the modern mind the true bearing of a Mystery of Sex. Misunderstanding is fatally easy, yet, if we do not mistake, it would seem as if these Sons of a Chosen Race were following a true path, even if with stumbling footsteps, and that some of the worst evils humanity suffers to-day might disappear, and the birth of a less inglorious race be assured, if some dim realisation of the meaning of spiritual eugenics might illumine the social darkness of to-day.

The foregoing paragraph was written in 1914 and there seems no reason to modify the opinion then expressed. During sixteen intervening years much water has run under the bridge and the whole subject of sexual relations has developed an importance in the public mind, and been discussed with an unreserve in which it is not by any means always easy to recognise the scientific temperament, nor yet the religious spirit, though discussion flows vigorously along the channels of orthodox religion. Mr. Waite's sincerity we cannot question, but the slimy connotations which too often have clouded and polluted the subject, in literature and in life, make it one requiring exceptionally cautious and even reverent treatment. The author seems to us to have brought these conditions to bear and we wish his book no better fate than to receive the understanding of sincere and reverent readers.

EDITH WARD

[We will permit ourselves only one extract from *The Secret Doctrine* of H. P. BLAVATSKY to enlighten the above interesting review. —EDS.]

Creative powers in man were the gift of divine wisdom, not the result of sin. This is clearly instanced in the paradoxical behaviour of Jehovah, who first *curses* Adam and Eve (or Humanity) for the supposed committed crime, and then *blesses* his "chosen people" by saying "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth" (*Gen. ix.* 1). The curse was not brought on mankind by the Fourth Race, for the comparatively sinless Third Race, the still more gigantic Antediluvians, had perished in the same way; hence the Deluge was no punishment, but simply a result of a periodical and geological law. Nor was the curse of KARMA called down upon them for seeking *natural* union, as all the mindless animal-world does in its proper seasons; but, for abusing the creative power, for desecrating the divine gift, and wasting the life-essence for no purpose except bestial personal gratification. When understood, the third chapter of Genesis will be found to refer to the Adam and Eve of the closing Third and the commencing Fourth Races. In the beginning, conception was as easy for woman as it was for all animal creation. Nature had never intended that woman should bring forth her young ones "in sorrow." Since that period, however, during the evolution of the Fourth Race, there came enmity between its seed, and the "Serpent's" seed, the seed or product of *Karma* and divine wisdom. For the seed of woman or lust, *bruised the head* of the seed of *the fruit of wisdom and knowledge*, by turning the holy mystery of procreation into animal gratification; hence the law of Karma "bruised the *heel*" of the Atlantean race, by gradually changing physiologically, morally, physically, and mentally, the whole nature of the Fourth Race of mankind. How wise and grand, how far-seeing and morally beneficent are the laws of Manu on connubial life, when compared with the licence tacitly allowed to man in civilized countries. That those laws have been neglected for the last two millenniums does not prevent us from admiring their forethought. The Brahmin was a *grihastha*, a family man, till a certain period of his life, when, after begetting a son, he broke with married life and became a chaste Yogi. His very connubial life was regulated by his Brahmin astrologer in accordance with his nature. Therefore, in such countries as the Punjab, for instance, where the lethal influence of Mussulman, and later on of European, licentiousness, has hardly touched the orthodox Aryan castes, one still finds the finest men—so far as stature and physical strength go—on the whole globe; whereas the mighty men of old have found themselves replaced in the Deccan, and especially in Bengal, by men whose generation becomes with every century (and almost with every year) dwarfed and weakened. . . .

Mankind, having passed from the ethereal to the solid physical state, from spiritual to physiological procreation, is now carried onward on the opposite arc of the cycle, toward that second

phase of its primitive state, when *woman knew no man*, and human progeny *was created, not begotten.*

That state will return to it and to the world at large, when the latter shall discover and really appreciate the truths which underlie this vast problem of sex. It will be like "the light that never shone on sea or land," and has to come to men through the Theosophical Society. That light will lead on and up to the *true spiritual intuition.* Then (as expressed once in a letter to a theosophist), "the world *will have a race of Buddhas and Christs*, for the world will have discovered that individuals *have it in their own powers to procreate Buddha-like children—or demons.*" "When that knowledge comes, all dogmatic religions, and with these the demons, will die out." (Vol. II, 410,15.)

The Franciscan Adventure. By VIDA DUTTON SCUDDER. (J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., London. 15s.)

The similarity of the life cycle of the Franciscan group to that of every other movement whose motive force is the fellowship of man, is seen in this skilful, vivid record, which traces the awakening of the seed in the ground already ripe, the early joyous struggles, the fatal phase of popularity, when the group outgrew its strength, so that the soul grew dim while the corporate body waxed stronger; thence to attempts by sincere but less clear-visioned followers to interpret spiritual paradox in terms of material compromise, leading thus to alteration and reversal of the original tenets; and so downward, on the one hand to jog-trot indifference, and on the other to dissension, fanaticism, persecution and decay.

Miss Scudder analyses the past achievement and defeat, and the future promise of the movement, in the application of its principles to the social problems of to-day. The friars' tenderness and unconventionality helped to free people from the old formalities, the heart of the matter, according to Miss Scudder, being the Franciscan attitude to personal possessions and the higher powers of character,—renunciation of the first leading to the acquisition of the second; but the movement failed because of the "partial application and the limitation of its scope to the few," and while the present time is ripe for a revival of the Franciscan ideal, "it can never be realized in a civilization based on unchecked right to private property".

But that ideal, or Miss Scudder's interpretation of it, has also an incomplete basis. Mere material relinquishment of possessions will not lead to brotherhood while body, mind and desires are equally private property. False renunciation, beginning with externals, leads to selfishness, a point corroborated by this record. Man is a spiritual being, working from within without, and cannot be reformed from outside as Miss Scudder seems to hope, despite her own statement that a psychological transformation is the first requisite. With universal, impersonal vision, true renunciation of property and right use of property are no longer seen as different.

The author's perplexity, as well as the reader's understanding, would be helped by carrying into the mental outlook "the sense of the Whole! Only healing for our social ills. Evil inheres in the partial, the divided; where shall the cure for evil be sought except in unity?"

W.W.

CORRESPONDENCE

BANSHEES

In a country with such scenery as one encounters in Ireland, scenery that is sometimes wildly beautiful but more often, perhaps, depressing in its sense of extreme solitude and sadness, it is not altogether surprizing to find credulity in phantasms that harmonize both with the natural surroundings and the atmosphere. These phantasms are popularly known as Banshees. The word Banshee is apparently a contraction of the Irish "Bean Sidhe," variously translated "The woman of the Barrow," "The lady of death," "The woman of sorrow," "A woman of the fairy race". Banshees are spirit entities associated with the old races of Ireland, that invariably, when materialized, assume the guise of women. By old races I mean those people whose forebears were inhabitants of Ireland prior to the coming to Ireland of the Anglo-Normans and Welsh in the twelfth century, A. D. Though a Banshee may be heard and seen by people who are not of such Irish descent, it is only when they are in the company of someone who has such a strain of blood in their veins. Banshees are strictly racial, though not confined to Ireland. They follow the fortunes of the particular family they haunt—for some peculiar reason they have attached themselves to certain families—no matter where those families roam.

Hence Banshees are seen and heard outside Ireland, in America, Spain and other countries where Irishmen have settled, more often, perhaps, to-day than they are seen and heard on Irish soil. No one knows the origin of Banshees. It is generally agreed, however, by such authorities on ghost and fairy lore as Sir Walter Scott, Pierse Ferriter and McAnnaly that they date back to very remote ages, probably to prehistoric times. For my own part I doubt if they are the spirits of people who have ever inhabited material bodies. I am more inclined to believe they belong to a species, call them ghosts, fairies, elementals or what you will, that are quite distinct and apart from the human race, albeit for some strange reason they take a special interest in those who are of ancient Irish lineage. In appearance they vary very much. In the case of the O'Neills of Shane Castle, the O'Briens of Thomond, and certain other families the Banshee is in the form of a very beautiful girl with red gold hair and large blue or grey eyes.

Usually she is clad in a green garment. In other families she is old and haggish and dressed in black, witch-like. In other families, again, she is lovely but nude or clad in garments of hues other than green or black. Banshees are invariably the harbingers of misfortune, generally of death. The death of a member of the family to which they are attached. This member, as a rule, is unaware of their presence. Their manner of demonstrating their advent differs very much. Some Banshees wail and moan, some clap their hands, some laugh, and some just sigh or are alarmingly silent. Sometimes they are seen, sometimes only heard, sometimes both seen and heard. The clan to which I belong claiming Milesian descent (the poetical name for Ireland, by the way, is "daughter of O'Donnell") we consequently have attached to us various Banshees that have been written about and described by many Irish authors.

Prior to the death of my father—he was murdered in a very dastardly fashion by Europeans at Arkiko, Red Sea Coast—and the death of my mother several years later, a Banshee was heard wailing inside and outside the house we occupied in Ireland. I did not hear it, I was but a child in the nursery, but I heard it, years later, immediately before the death of my uncle, who was head of our branch of the family. What happened was this:—One night, in midsummer I was lying awake, thinking of nothing in particular, when my dog in the garden began to bark furiously and then to whine

in a way that was altogether unusual. Wondering what was the matter I was about to get up, when there was a series of the most unearthly cries and moans that seemed to proceed from the hall. (I was on the first floor. There were only two storeys.) I say unearthly because, although the cries were in a measure human, I could detect, every now and then, distinct, though to me unintelligible, words in an apparent woman's voice; there was, at the same time, something terribly eerie and unnatural about them. Something I had never experienced before. If I can liken the cries to anything earthly at all, I should say they most nearly resembled a woman in the direst physical or mental anguish. My wife who was awake heard them, too, and at her request I got up at once and went on to the landing, where I found every other inmate of the house. They were standing in a group, obviously badly scared and greatly mystified. The cries continued for some minutes and then left off, to recommence shortly afterwards under one of the bedroom windows. We all ran to the window and peered out, but could see no one, although it was a very bright moonlight night. I then went into the garden and searched everywhere, my dog refusing to accompany me. It lay crouching on the ground, occasionally whining and shivering. I could discover nothing that would account for the sounds which still went on, but I was very conscious of some uncanny presence. After a while the cries and groaning grew feebler and continued doing so till, finally, they ceased. Directly that happened my dog got up, sniffed the air, and walked about the garden not as usual but with its tail rather between its legs. The following day I received a wire saying my uncle was dead. He had died about three o'clock in the morning. It was about one o'clock when we heard the Banshee.

Though attempts have sometimes been made to get into communication with a Banshee, no one, on anything like evidential testimony, has succeeded, and consequently this strange entity is still wholly enigmatical. The idea, as propounded by certain writers who are not old Irish and who have no first hand experience of this national phenomenon, that it is merely a thought-form is sheer rubbish.

The Banshee is an objective superphysical entity. Not only can it make itself seen and heard, but it is, as I have said, prophetic. More than that, it can open and shut doors and behave in a manner impossible in a mere thought-form. Families who possess a Banshee, and they are not legion, though they dread its advent, would not be without it, for there is something indescribably fascinating about it, something that makes one want to say most fervently "Thank God I am old Irish, real Irish".

ELLIOTT O'DONNELL

[ELLIOTT O'DONNELL is well known as author of ghost stories, and of books on abnormal psychic experiences.—EDS.]

THE CINEMA AS THE MATERIALIZATION OF THE HUMAN MIND AND SPIRIT

The Cinema is a Machine for seeing—I mean seeing in the physical sense. It offers nothing to vision or the intellectual power. It does not initiate into spiritual truth. It neither inspires nor purifies nor refines. It is the outcome of a Machine Age. It is fitted for its particular purpose, the portrayal of material objects and agents, and the symbols of a machine-made civilisation. It is capable in proper hands of becoming an organic part of a machine-made community, as in Soviet Russia, and of serving the community. Till recently it has been, however, part of a vast Money-production machine. The evil achieved by it is considerable. It has pandered to the vilest appetites. It has profaned the noblest emotions, in particular, Love. It has exhibited a dunghill composed of sex, war and crime. And for self-discipline and self-control, it has substituted senseless and shapeless impulses, feelings and sentiments. Can anything then worthy of the name of spiritual proceed from such a machine? I feel inclined to doubt it. At all events during my exploration of the Cinema in

Cinema countries at wartime and after I gathered abundant evidence of the guilt of the Cinema in materialising the human mind and spirit.

Present space permits me to offer evidence of guilt drawn only from after-war countries. I may conveniently consider this under two heads; the conscious and unconscious materialisation of mind and spirit. By conscious, I mean the intentional use of the Cinema for the purpose of materalising the mind of the community. By unconscious, the exhibition of a picture that unintentionally contains materialising factors into which the audience can read its state of mind produced by struggle and disaster.

Two excellent examples of the intentional use of the Cinema occur in Soviet Russia and Germany. The Soviet Cinema affords the finest example of the power of the Cinema to act as a mechanical and materialising agent. The Soviet Government have never made the slightest attempt to regard the Cinema otherwise than as a powerful materialising agent. From the first they have been compelled so to regard it by their materialistic conception of the State and Society, and by their conception of the Theatre and Cinema as social manifestations. Together these instruments of interpretation and reproduction have all along been made the framework for the material image into which the Russian people under the Bolshevist system of Government is being transformed. The task of the Cinema was an easy one. All it had to do was to portray a Machine Age of which it was the outcome and a part; and the mechanistic development of a new Society. Practically it had to portray a mass of workers hounded to revolution by mis-government, repression, war, starvation and political and economic chaos; attaining power invested in a communist Government, presented with a new conception of a new dispensation, called a Workers' Republic; fighting for life against enemies within and without the Republic; striving to construct a national machine or organisation according to the materialistic interpretation of Marx and Lenin; and building up a machine-made civilisation according to the Five Years Plan which, in pursuit of a Workers' Industrial State, has taken a path paved with machines.

So the Soviet Cinema has come to portray mechanical and materialist symbols, material and materialised emotions,—emotions bred of class-war, of a worldly memory and aspiration. Likewise to exhibit pictures that ridicule the religion, the social and cultural aspiration of the old order of society, and glorify the mechanistic and materialist aspiration of the new. Hence its historical, recapitulation and reconstruction pictures that portray the worker as slave; then as slave awaking; then as slave awakened, throwing off the shackles of the old order of society; and then to-day, the slave as master moulding a materialistic civilisation and culture. Such themes appear in particular in Potemkin, The Last Days of St. Petersburg, The General Line, Earth, Turk Sib (in which a new railroad is the hero struggling to save the country from economic disaster).

The Soviet Cinema then portrays the bigger struggle between Life and Death—a struggle from which all spiritual factors have been removed. The German Cinema, since the War, has likewise been organised to portray the eternal struggle between Life and Death, but with the difference that whereas the Soviet Cinema would admit no "soul" the German Cinema has glanced toward "soul" without however being able to admit it. That is to say, the German Fight for Life has been associated with such terms as soul, spirit, spiritualisation. The traditional German spirit found in the old German philosophies and culture has been invoked to aid Germany in maintaining the patriotic devotion of its own people and to win sympathy from foreign peoples. But the spirit has never entered the Cinema. Though the works of great German philosophers like Goethe, and the activities of great religious reformers like Luther, have been made the subject of pictures, in, for instance,

Faust and Martin Luther, the basic emotions portrayed were merely materialised ones.

About 1919 there was a proposal by the Picture Production Magnates to put the German "soul" into the pictures with the aid of the young revolutionist artists, who, having been deeply touched by the War, were burning to have a finger in the new dispensation. The proposal was praiseworthy. For obvious reasons it could not lead to much.

So two elements entered into the composition of German pictures. There was the commercial element put there by the Magnates who sought to exploit the needs of the public aroused by crisis after crisis, and to make money by doing so. Every crisis had its commercial value. The French invasion of the Ruhr called forth pictures of the Rhine and Nibelung type, which, while intended to strengthen public resistance against French encroachment were intended also to repay with profit the high sums expended on their production.

Then there was the æsthetic element put there by the Expressionists who entered the Cinema at the invitation of the Magnates with the intention of putting "soul" or "spirit" into the pictures. This they were unable to do, for they had not the requisites for the execution of their high intent. As the Dr. Caligari and Golem and Mabuse type of pictures show, they had form and not content. In the first picture they were solely concerned with Space conceived of as a plastic material. I shall not stop to estimate the degree of soul caricature in the form provided by these æsthetes. On the whole their æsthetic form was as materialistic as the commercial content—a horrible study of insanity. By them, the picture was christened not christianised. The same may be said of most of the pictures that came to exhibit the mind of the studio artist,—cubist, futurist, expressionist, sur-realist, and the rest. They ruled out substance and appealed solely to worldlings attracted by surfaces.

Evidence of unconscious materialisation came from all parts of the War- and Revolution-stricken area, more especially from primitive communities. Such communities are apt to take the emotions awakened by horrible conditions and read them into the material objects of the screen from which of course they could derive no spiritual benefit. Their feeling might be of bitterness accompanied by a wish to continue the fight. The leading figure in the picture might be a spotless hero overcoming great odds by sheer physical strength, as in the best type of Western cowboy picture. The effect is to stimulate the audience to renewed exertion, but of a physical kind. The Cinema tells them that victory must come on wheels not on wings.

HUNTLY CARTER

[MR. CARTER has already written in our pages in December 1930, on "Drama the Organic Part of Human Life". He is the author of several interesting volumes on the drama and cinema, the latest of which is *The Cinema as the Materialization of the Human Mind and Spirit*.—Eds.]

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"————ends of verse
And sayings of philosophers."

HUDIBRAS.

Not concerned with political moves and wire-pulling, we need not examine the conflicting causes which have led to the present saddening situation in India. The aftermath of the Round Table Conference has manifested itself in disappointment and uncertainty on the one hand, and on the other in the rule by Ordinances. It is not really important to ascertain if certain Congress leaders were right in talking about or even precipitating the Civil Disobedience Movement, or, on the other side, whether the Government had any justification for the course it has adopted. Rising superior to partisan feeling—by no means an easy task—we must try to look at the energies active in the invisible blood of all who are engaged in the struggle. The issues of the case are not red-shirts against machine guns, not no-rent campaigns against *lathis*. There is but one issue, and that is —who is to determine the kind of administration that India will have in the future? It is the outer and visible expression of the real invisible issue—shall ancient Asian or modern Western ideas and ideals prevail? Looked at in that light the whole problem assumes different proportions and a new value.

———

What are the vital results of the Round Table Conference?

India has gained substantially by showing the world that it has already produced leaders who are in every respect the equals of the flower of western statesmanship and diplomacy. The world has seen not only that in die-hardism a Shaukat Ali is no whit behind a Churchill; but also that in political acumen a Sapru is as good as a Reading; in sweet reasonableness and integrity in compromise a Sastri can score over a Sankey; in oratory a Malaviya can defeat a Macdonald. Above all, no Englishman at the Conference or in the United Kingdom rose to the height of Gandhiji in his intellectual simplicity and honesty, in his mystical practicality, in his intuitive insight, in his readiness to yield generously and claim in humble confidence all that he felt he could with justice. The world has now seen the great capacity of Indian publicists grouped together, and knows that there are numerous other equally talented minds in this vast peninsula.

On the other hand, India has lost substantially inasmuch as these publicists have failed in showing unity of purpose and programme. Certain Muslims and some others could not visualize

the good of the whole, their attention being fixed on separate communities and provinces. What was but a suspicion is now a clearly proven fact, and the world knows that all the love and sacrifice of Gandhiji could not overcome separatist tendencies. This failure has raised hopes among the opponents of the Congress and they are experimenting to see if that political body "doth possess the power or only pretendeth".

For a long while now India has felt, strongly maybe, but still it was only a feeling, that those who eat her salt in active service or in pensioned retirement are not only ranged against her but even wield an influence in Downing Street itself. This feeling has now become an experienced fact. The strength of this influence has been in evidence at the Round Table Conference, and its manipulative faculty is clearly to be discerned in the altered outlook of the hour which followed the change of government in England. That same influence must be seen at the back of the sudden and swift imprisonment of Congress leaders and organizers. The present official action may succeed in striking the hearts of the Congress supporters with terror; and it is possible that out of fear the Congress Movement may receive a set-back. But psychologists know that fear and hatred are twin aspects of one emotion, and what recedes under fear emerges later as hatred. It would be an interesting psychological problem to measure the wave-length of fear-energy flowing out of the suppressed activity of the Congress, into an insidious non-Congress programme, to emerge presently as hate-energy.

But there is the other aspect: Are the Indian people really steeped in the Gandhi philosophy and its socio-political programme? Their leaders in prison, and none left to advise and organize them, how many will eschew boycott-mentality and embrace Svadeshi soulfulness? How many will give up drink and adopt a pure Svadeshi life from inner conviction, even if the orange-saried Sevikas with their fair persuasion are absent? It may be that the very absence of leaders will give a new impetus to the Congress Movement, and the real, not nominal followers of Gandhiji may greatly increase in number. These may prepare themselves philosophically and psychologically for future action. Such a procedure would be watched with interest by the student of mysticism and Theosophy. If large numbers in India should do that, it would affect beneficently the thoughts of all who desire to better the state of civilization moving from within without.

With Gandhiji in gaol the question before every thoughtful Congressman is—in *what* lies preparation for India? The Westernized Native will answer —diplomacy and force, of which Russia is an example. The real Asia answers—SOUL-FORCE with which Krishna fought, Buddha triumphed and Jesus sacrificed.

卐

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light ! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. III MARCH 1932 No. 3

IN SEARCH OF PEACE

Fight the good fight. The field of duty is the field of battle. Jehad is the holy war. Fired by such watch-words the earnest aspirant begins war on the plane of the soul.

In the literature of mysticism there is no volume more popular than the *Bhagavad-Gita*, and it is, *par excellence*, the book of war—the greatest of all wars, that which the Soul wages against the demons of doubt, hypocrisy and selfishness.

Men and women are attached to their woes. Even though they perceive the source of these to be their own blood-bonds of desires, Arjuna-like they still hesitate to give battle. Therefore seers and sages, who are men of peace, call upon mortals to fight for the kingdom of immortality. The greater the pacifist, the more doughty the soul-warrior. This is the central message of the *Gita*. Krishna, in whose consciousness mortals and immortals, men and beasts and all things inhere; a consciousness which is the resting-place of the universe and the kingdom of supreme repose—Krishna plays the part of the Generalissimo of the Pandava armies.

Numerous examples can be quoted to show that he who desires to be at peace within himself and with his neighbours invariably wages a strenuous war against his own lower nature, and thereby draws on himself the ire of other lower natures present in his own society. There is a strange law in Occultism under which the resolute aspirant galvanizes the dormant vices within himself so that he may overpower them. Also he acts as the catalyzer for other people's lower natures and

tendencies.

This must be the reason for the recommendation which every aspirant receives—"Seek the company of the soul. Recognize that flesh, your erstwhile friend, is your foe. Withhold your mind from all external objects. Withhold internal images lest on your soul-light a dark shadow they should cast. And seek, O beginner, to blend your mind and soul."

Our weaknesses and blemishes cause an intoxication and blind us to the presence of the soul. The aspirant in his earnestness pays more attention to his ignoble selfishness than to the Noble Self, his real soul. This war-mentality overtakes him who desires to be the friend of all creatures, and often he makes the same mistake as the patriot whose love for his own land causes him to be jealous and suspicious of other peoples—especially neighbours. In this Kali-yuga, era of dark weaknesses, the constructive aspect of the *Gita* and other martial books is overlooked, and the destructive task assumes a very prominent position. This in itself is a formidable obstacle and makes the living of the spiritual life more difficult than it need be.

It is a striking fact, though often passed over, that the *Gita's* programme is constructive. The refrain "*therefore* stand up and fight," is not causal. The holy war against evil in us *has* to be waged, but by the constructive weapon of clear thinking founded on true philosophical principles. We *have* to kill the enemy but we have also to recognize that he is but another aspect of the same immortal Self, and in reality cannot be done away with, but only assigned his own legitimate place.

No one however powerful can arrive at peace by a continuous engagement in war. Constructive work can really be done during the periods of peace. This is not only a truth of history; in spiritual life also it holds good. When one stricken with the vision of his own many blemishes pulls himself together and gives them battle, prolonged and persistent, he arrives at a state of complete spiritual exhaustion; he has to learn the art of living at peace in the midst of untamed enemies, to engage himself in constructive work surrounded by agents of dark destruction. He must not be frightened of the enemy, for then he cannot be overthrown. He must labour constructively, gathering his resources of virtue and wisdom, and in silence develop the necessary sense of humour without which soul-foes are well-nigh unconquerable. Moral weaknesses and vices are verily sprites who assume new airy forms to attack the soul again and yet again. Therefore while war against the animal in us must be waged, the task of gathering soul-force within ourselves must not be neglected.

The lesson to be learned, then, is that we should in the first place seek the Krishna, the Christos, the Buddha within. Its nature and powers once understood by

the mind will make the dethronement of the enemy, Duryodhana, Satan, or Mara, more easy and more possible. We are so apt to engage ourselves in meddling with, purifying and controlling the lower, that we find no time to contemplate the higher, be energized and inspired by it.

To blend mind and soul means that the thinking principle, which at present is attracted by the passions and desires and impressed by their contact with the objects of sense, is so modified as to be impressed by soul-knowledge, *i.e.*, knowledge inherent in the soul. To cleanse the mirror of the mind on which the dust of conflicting passions has accumulated we need an intelligent cleaner. This is the soul. The soul is not the collection of ideas and aspirations of the man of senses. The soul is an entity, distinct from the mind and its arguments and knowledge, distinct from the desires and their longings, distinct from the sensorium and its receptivity. The soul is superior to, and other than, all these. It has the power to look upon ideas directly, and does so by the faculty of intuition. It has the power to emanate compassion because it has within it the vision of the eternal fitness of all things bound together in one grand unity. It has the power to move in every direction producing sacrifice—not useless sacrifice, but the necessary sacrifice natural to itself. The holy war cannot be waged in the absence of Krishna whose instructions logical, consistent, unanswerable, must be impressed upon the mind of man—*Nara*, one of the names of Arjuna.

Therefore it is well to turn to the soul *first* and gain a perception of its beneficent and constructive programme. The dealing with the man of flesh is only a secondary phase. The shadow of destruction is bound to disappear as the sun of the Self rises on the horizon of the mind. No doubt it will mean hard labour to remove the dirt and the debris of the night-life of the devil in us, but the Light of the Soul reveals the horror of the darkness, and with the dawn comes strength and wisdom.

If you have the power to face your own soul in the darkness and silence, you will have conquered the physical or animal self which dwells in sensation only.

LIGHT ON THE PATH

FIVE LIGHTS AT THE CROSS ROADS

[**Geoffrey West**, whose reputation as a biographer and critic steadily increases, has written for us five special studies which throw light upon an obscure but important period of history. These form a setting for the figure of Jesus by showing some of the mental forces at work, both those which helped to shape the world of his day, and those operating in the century succeeding his death.—EDS.]

I. PTOLEMY SOTER

Whatever one's personal conception of or attitude to ultimate truth, still every religious formula must have power simply as myth, as pure poetic hypothesis. How much more so, then, Theosophy, which claims the status of Religion itself. And indeed the effect is that of a lamp suddenly illuminated behind the semi-transparent screen, hitherto so opaque, of universal history. Life, that was chaos, falls into the pattern of an endless chain, the links of which are individual greatness. The panorama of the past becomes a mighty drama pointing to the future, a drama of the multitude of men rejecting their heritage of a Wisdom they can never quite shatter or forget, watched over as it is by careful guardians. A Wisdom every man, each in his own way, must serve, however unconsciously. Touch where one will, the living contact is made. Take, for closer study, five names almost at random out of distant centuries: Ptolemy Soter, Apollonius of Tyana, Simon Magus, Hillel, Simon ben Yohai—a soldier, a sage, a magician, two Jewish teachers of early Christian days. What conceivable connection can there be between them all? And yet ....

Ptolemy steps into history as a decisive force in the world's destinies at a dramatic moment. It was in the year 323 B. C., at Babylon. Alexander the Great was dead, and his heirs, his generals rather, had gathered to appoint a successor—or was it to divide the spoils of the greatest empire the world had ever seen? They scarcely knew themselves, eyeing one another and waiting for someone else to speak. Especially to Ptolemy they must have looked for a lead. He was at this time in the prime of his manhood, forty-four years of age, stout possibly but robust and energetic, his rather fleshy features—he was less than handsome—expressing qualities of determination relieved by a personal kindliness. He had been some ten years old at Alexander's birth, and thus was one of the seniors among the young prince's companions who constituted his bodyguard, sharing his arduous training, his tutorship under Aristotle, his brief disgrace and exile, and finally, upon King Philip's death, his rise to power. He would seem to have accompanied Alexander upon all his principal expeditions, to Egypt

in 332, when Alexandria was founded and the country brought securely under Macedonian rule, to Babylon, and presently to India; he was also prominent in the famous "Marriage of the East and West" at Susa in 324, when he wedded a Persian princess who vanishes from his life as instantly as she had entered it. Always he was one of the most trusted and intimate of the king's seven generals, holding his place not only by personal courage and charm of manner but by diligence, shrewdness, caution, and the ability to mind his own business. He avoided the quarrels and jealousies of the others, and consequently was liked as well by his fellow commanders as by his own soldiers. And now, at this decisive moment, he was probably the one man present who had looked far enough ahead to sort his ambition with the safety of moderation. He argued very reasonably against the concentration of power in the hands of Alexander's feeble-minded half-brother, but his suggestion of satrapships within the empire made no hint of actual division. Let Perdiccas be regent; for himself he sought only the governorship of distant Egypt.

It has been charged against Ptolemy that his caution marred his greatness. Perhaps, and yet in the result he achieved more greatly than any of his fellows, founding the securest dynasty of them all, preserving the comparative peace and prosperity of Egypt in an age of warfare, and being, incidentally, the only one of Alexander's generals to die a natural death and at a ripe age. Certainly he was capable of decisive action, as when he seized Alexander's body, as when he swept aside the one human obstacle to his absolute authority in Egypt by executing him on a charge of corruption of imperial moneys; while if he rejected the opportunity to succeed the assassinated Perdiccas in 321, his desire thirteen years later to marry Alexander's full sister Cleopatra held a significance clear enough to his rival for power, Antigonus, who promptly poisoned the lady. Destiny held him to his post. Continually he thrust out feelers in the form of military expeditions, more than once seizing and relinquishing contested territory, yet never imperilling possession of his chosen land. Not indeed until 305 did he proclaim himself king even there, receiving the titles of the Pharaohs as "supreme divine power in the land of Egypt," though his divine status was not officially established there until after his death in 283. Only the Rhodians worshipped him, as Soter or Saviour, in his own lifetime.

The wise caution, the cautious wisdom, of Ptolemy appears even better in his internal treatment of Egypt than in these larger relations. The Greeks had originally come to the country as allies, deliverers from the Persian yoke. They remained as conquerors, and it was Ptolemy's policy to make their occupation permanent by giving grants of land and money to the Macedonians who settled

there. But he also sought, as definitely and successfully, to conciliate the Egyptians, and especially to win the approval of the priests, the most wealthy, organised, and generally powerful section of the native community, and the most influential force for either submission or revolt. He built temples, he gave land to the gods; according to a contemporary inscription "he brought back the images of the gods found in Asia; all the furniture and the books of all the temples of North and South Egypt, he had them restored to their place".

Minor reforms also might be set to his credit, but his real claim to the world's memory and esteem rests upon his establishment first of Alexandria as a great cosmopolitan centre; second of the Museum and Library, and last of the worship of Serapis. It is hard to say which sets him highest. The third perhaps was the greatest single achievement, yet the influence of the second when linked to the first was to be at least apparently more permanent.

Alexander may have projected Alexandria; it was Ptolemy who made it what it became. Greeks, Egyptians, and Jews alike were drawn to it by various means. For a while it was to be the world's greatest city, and even before Ptolemy's death had grown to twice the size of Syracuse, three times that of Athens, larger even than the contemporary Rome. It was more than a port teeming with the vessels of every sea-faring nation; it was famous too for its carpets, its perfumes, its paper manufacture. Vast wealth was lavished in the construction of its harbour, its streets, its majestic buildings—temples, theatres, warehouses, granaries, palaces, gymnasiums, amphitheatres, monuments, tombs, the famous lighthouse, gardens, groves, its zoo, its Museum and Library.

These last, established in the Greek or Royal Quarter of the city, were, with their courts and cloisters, their halls and lecture-rooms, their connecting colonnades of costly Egyptian marble, their adornments of obelisks and sphinxes, only typical of the splendour of the whole. The Museum, broadening the basis of the Athenian schools of philosophy on which it was modelled, has been called the world's first university, the site of the earliest attempt to achieve that systematic organisation of knowledge outlined by Aristotle. It was the creation of a man at least sufficiently his pupil to love learning for its own sake; Ptolemy subsidised it, but he made no effort to bind it to the spreading of any especial teaching. It was sufficient to bring wise men together, and in fact he and his immediate successors assembled a company which included such men as Euclid, Eratosthenes, Archimedes, Apollonius of Perga, Hipparchus, Hero, Herophilus, Callimachus, Apollonius of Rhodes, and Theocritus. The Museum's earliest work was mainly scientific, being specially distinguished in mathematics, medicine, and geography.

Under Ptolemy III it was still the chief centre of Hellenic culture, and though historians note a subsequent decline towards pedantry its importance for some centuries is incalculable. The Library was its immediate offspring, originating in a suggestion of Demetrius of Phalerum, first director of the Museum. In its scope it was something absolutely new. Works were bought, or copied, for it all over the Greek world; in some cases, it is said, the originals would be borrowed and only copies returned. Before the close of the third century well over 500,000 rolls were housed within its walls, and eventually the numbers rose to 700,000, though some of these were probably duplicates made for extra reference or for sale. It was an accumulation of knowledge such as men had never known before.

The essential importance of the cult of Serapis does not lie in such problems as whether or not it originated in the Egyptian worship of Osiris-Apis, whether it was chosen because this God, as "the Lord Oserapis," already enjoyed a certain prestige among Greeks resident in Egypt, whether the choice of a Greek type for the image of the deity was deliberate, and so forth, but rather in its theosophical suggestion, assertion rather, that all the gods were but one god under many names, that all were, at most, but facets of a single truth. It was that, the force of an ever-new, if very ancient, veracity suddenly perceived as such, that gave the cult its power and appeal, not any mere patronage on the part of king and court. By its own power, by the power of the truth that was in it, it spread east and west to become one of the great faiths of later paganism. Many were the temples dedicated to its name; after three hundred years it stood high in the favour of the imperial court of Rome itself. Inevitably, as the years went by, it had been tainted by the accessions of human ignorance and superstition, yet the core of truth endured, to bequeath its legacy through Gnosticism to Christianity. It reached out to touch even early Buddhism, and its relation to the Neo-Platonism of Ammonius Saccas is evident.

Alexandria, the Museum and Library, Serapis—it would be difficult to name three products of any other period as essential to the progressive development of a Western knowledge fertilised by the ancient wisdoms of the East. From them the pollen of enlightenment was to be carried through many lands and centuries. And all three were the creations of one man—Ptolemy Soter!

The first two are plain achievements for everyone to scan and estimate. But his attitude as an innovator in the religious field really is more difficult to discern. It is possible to present his motives as primarily political, the work of a man cynical in affairs of the spirit and only concerned to reconcile the religious beliefs of a mixed community. Again, one can show him and his followers

in the part of raw boys coming into an ancient temple, simply impressed by the sheer antiquity, the felt mystery, of the traditional Egyptian religion (he revealed his clear interest in the Egyptian past by causing its history to be recorded by both Greek and native scholars). It may be so, and yet such explanations scarcely satisfy. Egypt was the home of ancient wisdoms, perhaps, to which, in the absence of still older Eastern sources, the lands of the West came for knowledge, but the Greeks were not utterly barbarians. The interest of Olympias, mother of Alexander, in the occult mysteries, was notorious; did no others at the Macedonian court, among them Ptolemy, share her knowledge? We have seen how well the teaching of Aristotle bore its fruit in the general practice of Ptolemy, and was not Aristotle the disciple of Plato, who, it is said, had learnt upon his travels in Egypt more than he could declare save secretly to his chosen pupils? Whether Ptolemy shared Alexander's pilgrimage to the ancient oracle of Ammon at Siwah in 332 must remain doubtful though the facts suggest that he did, but certainly they were together in India when, if Apollonius spoke true, his leader sought the company of the Sages of the holy mountain. Admittedly Alexander was only partially successful, but the quest itself implies a large degree of interest and initiative. The more these facts are pondered the more evident seems the existence of another Ptolemy, almost unknown to history, and but hinted at in the patron of the arts, of learning, of religion. His caution then ceases to be negative, becomes a phenomenal wisdom, as fruitful in its intention as in its results. Ptolemy, Soter indeed!

GEOFFREY WEST

वासनावृद्धितः कार्यं कार्यवृद्धया च वासना ।
वर्धते सर्वथा पुंसः संसारो न निवर्तते ॥

By the strength of *vāsanā* (an impression remaining unconsciously in the mind from past good or evil Karma) *kārya* (action) is accumulated; and by the accumulation of *kārya*, *vāsanā* increases. Thus the cycle of birth and death is not transcended.

GOETHE AND THE EAST

(*Westoestlicher Divan*)

[**Dr. F. Otto Schrader**, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology at Kiel University, Germany, was introduced to our readers last November when he wrote on "The Bhagavad-Gita in Ancient Kashmir".

He here presents to our readers a timely article on Goethe whose Centenary is being celebrated during this month—he died on the 22nd March 1832.—EDS.]

Among the works of Goethe there is one which by its very title seems to point to his relations to the East and for this reason seems to be worth being introduced to Eastern readers, the more so as it has so far been very little known except to Germans and advanced students of German literature.

The work is, indeed, concerned with the East, but only with that part of the East which is hinted at by the Turkish word *Divan* (for the Persian *devan* "assembly, council"), *i. e.*, the Islamic East. And even of the latter some features not congenial to our poet will be found missing. Sufism, for example, is conspicuous by its absence, because Goethe, who looked at Hafiz as the foremost model for his *Divan*, did not want him to be considered a mystic and openly remonstrated against those who thought otherwise. On the other hand, one pre-Islamic creed has been found worthy of a place in the midst of the Mohammedan surroundings, *viz.*, Parsism. As for Hinduism, the "country of the Brahmans" is, indeed, once referred to (in the Book Suleika) but for its riches only, while in one of his Notes on the *Divan* we find our poet so safely rooted in Islam and Zoroastrianism that he declines as unsound both India's idolatry as its "abstruse philosophy" (of both of which he knew little enough), another note declaring it as worthy of the highest admiration that "the fatal nearness of Indian idolatry has been unable to influence it" (*viz.*, Zoroastrianism). And yet it can be proved that Goethe was convinced of reincarnation,* but this was for him a Greek rather than an Indian theory, at least in the two poems of the *Divan* where it makes its appearance.

Goethe was a septuagenarian when he published his *Westoestlicher Divan* (West-eastern Diwan). It was the turbulent time after the Napoleonic wars when the grand old man, averse to politics, had turned his back on the patriotic turmoil and taken refuge in the Oriental contemplativeness of a Hafiz and

* For several sayings of his, in poetry and prose, professing or implying this belief, see my little work *The Religion of Goethe* published as No. 38 of the "Adyar Pamphlets" (Adyar, 1914). (On page 22 of it the words "he taught evolution" have been erroneously omitted before the last line. p. 27, "expressions" is wrong for "impressions".)

kindred authors whose acquaintance he made through the translations then available, with the occasional assistance of some orientalist.

The *Divan* is, as to extent, a little longer than the *Bhagavad-Gītā* and consists of twelve so-called Books each of which is headed by a Persian name. They are the Book of the Singer, B. Hafis, B. of Love, B. of Contemplations, B. of Discontent, B. of Maxims, B. of Timur, B. Suleika, Tavern B.,B. of Parables, B. of the Parsee, B. of Paradise. The Book Suleika (containing fifty pieces of poetry) fills nearly a quarter of the work, while the Book of Timur and the Book of the Parsee are the two shortest ones, each consisting only of one longer and one quite short poem. Hardly one of the Books, excepting the Parsi Nameh, forms one continuous whole, most of them being composed of several or many poems of different length and metres and rather miscellaneous contents. Nor do all of the poems belong to one and the same time: most, indeed, to the years 1814 and 1815, but some are later, and a few written even after the first edition. Some half a dozen (the number is disputed), and not the worst, are not even Goethe's, but contributed by a lady-friend of his (see below). The poetical value of the poems is also quite different: it is, on the whole, I should say, not very high, owing partly, no doubt, to the intentional didactic character of most of the latest works of our poet. There is a good deal in them which strikes one as artificial, forced and even hackneyed, and the rhyme is often felt as a disturbing factor. Still there is also in the *Divan* quite a number of veritable pearls.

The work is, of course, not intended merely to reflect the Oriental mind, but, as is indicated by its title, to somehow connect the East with the West. This is not only evident by the way in which Oriental ideas are handled, but also by some of the speakers in the several poems. Suleika, *e.g.*, is throughout this work imagined as identical with a German lady adored by Goethe at that time (Frau Marianne von Willemer of Frankfurt), and the "Poet" conversing with the "Huri" in the Book of Paradise is easily recognizable as Goethe himself. But the Western undercurrent becomes at times hardly discernible at all, and in many passages the "Einfuehlung" into the Islamic mind, the way in which the poet speaks as a Mahommedan, is simply admirable.

A full treatment of the *Divan* would require separate essays on its relation to Islam, its erotics, its gnomes, its parables, and so on. In this short essay we shall confine ourselves to giving the reader first an idea of the peculiar composition of most of the "Books" by glancing over the contents of the First Book, then going through the Parsi Nameh as the only Book consistently engaged in one subject, and finally try to convey a taste of the

sententious wisdom of the Divan.

The motto of the First Book refers to the proverbial prosperity of the noble Persian family of the Barmecides of Balkh (middle of eighth century): "Twenty years* did I let pass, enjoying what was apportioned to me—a series as perfectly beautiful as (was) the (happy) time (apportioned) to the Barmakids".† The first poem (of seven stanzas) is entitled "Hegire," *i.e.*, *hejira*, because therein the poet, thinking of Mohammed's flight from Mecca to Medina, informs us of his resolution to flee from the political hell of Europe (where "North and West and South go to pieces, thrones burst, and empires tremble") to the "pure East" "to taste patriarchal air" and become rejuvenated through "Chiser's fountain" by means of "loving, drinking and singing". Next comes the poem "Pledges of Bliss" giving a curiously dry definition, in five verses, of talisman, amulet, inscription, abraxas‡ and signet-ring. Then follows "Freisinn" (*i.e.* free-mindedness§), referring to the disembarrassment, felt in nomadic life, from the "unnaturalness" of civilized existence. The fourth poem called "Talismans" consists of five independent stanzas in different metres connected solely by their theistic character in that each of them is concerned with some aspect of the personal highest being. It begins with the famous words "Gottes ist der Orient! Gottes ist der Okzident! (God's is the East! God's is the West!), and it ends with the comparison, familiar to every Indian, of creation and withdrawal to exhaling and inhaling. Then comes "Four Boons," *i. e.*, those granted by God to the Arab, *viz.*, the turban, the tent, the sword, and the song. The next poem, "Confession," puts the question "What is difficult to conceal?" and answers that it is fire, love, and—most of all—a poem. The following poem, styled "Elements," states that a poet who wants to be like Hafiz must be able to mix properly the four elements of poetry, *viz.*, love, wine, arms, and the dislike of "what is intolerable and ugly". Then poem No. 8, called "Creating and Animating," tells us that, after God had made Adam out of a clod and the Elohim breathed "the best spirit" into his nose, it was Noah who crowned the work of creation by inventing the wine-cup, thus helping man to find his way back to "the temple of our creator". The small poem No. 9 called "Phenomenon" is

* General term for a time of some length.

† The German original here, as of all my quotations, is, of course, in verse.

‡ A special kind of talisman with an occult picture and the word *abraxas* or *abradzas* which, read as a numeral, means 365.

§ It should be borne in mind that the liberty of forming compound words is almost unrestricted in German and much made use of especially by the poets, and that this is one of the chief difficulties in translating German poetry into other European languages. The English compound "liberal-mindedness" denotes a feature of the character, which is not meant, but in Sanskrit, which has the same freedom of compounding as German, the translation *cittanirvighnatā* would be fairly exact.

an explanation of our white-haired yet vigorous poet's undauntable appreciation of the fair sex: it is like the rainbow produced by the pairing of Phœbus (the sun) with the whitish "wall of rain". No. 10, "Loveliness," is a glorification of dawn and sunshine. No. 11, "Discord," speaks of the disunion caused in the poet's mind by the sounds of nature threatening to become more attractive for him than his poetry. No. 12, "The Past in the Present," is an admonition not to regret the pleasures of by-gone days, but rather get hold of the past in the present by enjoying through others the pleasures formerly enjoyed by one's self. "Song and Sculpture" following next is a little poem placing the poet's art by the side of and, apparently, above sculpture. "Daring," also of three stanzas only, emphasizes the necessity, for the poet, of practical experience of life. "Rough and Smart" is a defence of the poet's wantonness against those who want him to be modest and decent. "All-leben" (Universal Life) is the common title of one poem of seven stanzas with an additional stanza and a rather independent supplement of two stanzas. Referring to Hafiz's praise of the dust trod by the feet of his sweetheart the old poet regrets having neither dust (in his "always clouded North") nor a sweetheart, and appeals to the thunderstorm to heal his soul by whirling up a dust-cloud and bring it down wetted as the womb of new life. The supplement is a charming little couplet:

> God gives us through the moth the likeness of life and through the eyes of our love his own likeness.

The last poem, called "Selige Sehnsucht" ("Blessed Longing") is perhaps the most admirable of all the smaller poems of Goethe's. The five small verses introduced by the warning not to impart their contents to anybody except the wise make up a true little Upaniṣad. The superficial reader will not find more in them than the teaching that self-sacrifice, as that of the moth entering the flame, is the door of immortality. But a careful reading, taking into account certain other sayings of Goethe's, will reveal the astonishing fact that here the act of reincarnation is described, the "butterfly" hindered by "no distance" being the departed soul drawn to rebirth by its karman, and the flame of the "quiet candle" being the flame of passion burning in the retreat of love.* The often-quoted concluding stanza, which is a later addition, confirms this interpretation. It runs:

> And as long as thou hast not grasped this die-and-become thou art but a dull guest on this dark earth.

The one book of the *Divan* which is entirely free from Islamic relations as well as erotics is the Book of the Parsee. It has the sub-title "Bequest of the Old-Persian Creed" and consists of

* For a translation and fuller discussion of the poem see the pamphlet mentioned in footnote on page 161.

nineteen stanzas followed by a postscript of twelve lines. It contains all the points of the Zoroastrian creed that appeared to be essential to our poet who had been inspired already in his early youth by the worship of the fiery element.* It opens with a question asked by an old Parsee (hardly Zarathustra himself) on his death-bed: "What bequest shall come to you, O brethren, from the parting one, the poor good man whom ye younger ones have patiently nursed, honouring his last days with loving care?" The answer is in the form of the "bequest" and naturally begins by drawing attention to the sun (verses 2 to 8). The king on horseback, surrounded by his grandees, all of them glittering with gold and precious stones—are they not totally eclipsed by "the sun rising on the wings of morning over the countless mountain-tops of Darnawend"? Does not its sight make us recognize God on his throne and exhort us to prove worthy in our life of the grand manifestation? "And thus," the old man goes on, "let my holy bequest entrusted to the brotherly will and memory be this: Daily preservation of heavy services (Schwerer Dienste taegliche Bewahrung). No revelation but this is needed" (v. 7). Let the new-born at once be turned to the sun in order to give a fire-bath to his body and soul (v. 8). Hand over the dead to the living; cover with rubbish and earth the (dead) animal and, as far as possible, whatever else may seem impure to you (v. 9). Let your fields be neat and clean; let trees grow in rows (v. 10). The water too in canals and ditches should be kept clean by never allowing it to stagnate, and exterminating reeds, rushes, salamanders and other monstrous creatures (v. 11-12). On earth and water thus purified the sun will shine with pleasure and produce life and bliss (v. 13). And only in a country thus purified may the priest venture "to beat God's likeness out of the stone" (v. 14). Wherever there is a flame, be aware that it is your benefactor; whenever you carry wood, mind that it is "the seed of the terrestrial sun"; whenever you pick *pambeh* (cotton), remember that it will become a wick and carry the divine (v. 15-16). Then no misfortune will ever prevent you from worshipping every morning the throne of God (v. 17). That (v. r.: There) is the imperial seal of our existence; it is for us and the angels the mirror reflecting God. And all who stammer the praise of the Highest are assembled there in circles round circles (v. 18). Let me renounce the banks of the Senderud and lift up my wings to the Darnawend to happily meet the radiant one in his glory and eternally bless you from the height. (v. 19). The postscript, which is not quite what might be expected here, may be summarized as follows: thoughtful men appreciative of wines will feel thankful for them "to

*Compare my *Religion of Goethe*, p. 4.

the glow which makes all this thrive" and stays in the grape as a power awakening many forces, though suffocating some; pernicious for the immoderate, but helpful to the moderate.

The gnomic wisdom of the *Divan* is not confined to the Book of Maxims, but there is a good deal of it also in the two Books preceding it. Of this branch of poetry Goethe is one of the most successful representatives, and he has always had a particular liking for it. The following are a few remarkable specimens.

In the Book of Contemplations we read :

What shortens time ? Activity ! What makes it unbearably long ? Sloth ! What causes debts ? Delay and submission ! What makes one win ? Quick resolution ! What procures honours ? Self-defence !

Further :

He who is inflamed by pure love, will be recognized by God.

Here we come also across some delightful sayings on women :

Be indulgent to women ! Out of a crooked rib she has been created ; God could not make her quite straight. When you bend her, she breaks ; when you leave her in peace, she becomes still more crooked ; O good Adam, what then is the worse ?—Be indulgent to women : it's no good if a rib of yours breaks.

The following is from the Book of Discontent.

And where peoples separate, despising each other, there neither will admit that they wish for the same.

If one is cheerful and good, the neighbour will not be long in tormenting him ; as long as the capable man lives and acts, they are prepared to stone him to death.

Out of the many striking sayings of the Book of Maxims half a dozen must suffice here.

The day is not over yet ; let men be busy ! The night will come when nobody can act.

Why do you complain of enemies ? How could such become your friends to whom your very being is an eternal reproach ?

Is there anything more intolerable than the wise being told by the dullard to behave modestly in their great days ?

Let yourself never be tempted to contradict ! The wise fall into ignorance by debating with the ignorant.

For what I feel most thankful to Allah ? For having separated suffering from knowing. Would not every sick person have to despair, if he knew the disease as the physician does ?

Whoever comes into the world, builds a new house and goes away, leaving it to a second. That one will arrange it differently, and none will finish it.

The Book concludes :

Know that I am utterly displeased when many sing and speak ! Who expels poetry from the world ?—The poets !

We take leave of the *Divan* with a quotation from the Book of Parables :

All men, great and little, spin a subtle texture for themselves and nicely sit in the midst of it with the points of their claws. Now, when a broom finds its way into it, they say that it is unheard of, and that the greatest palace has been destroyed.

F. O. SCHRADER

BENEATH THE SURFACE

INDIA'S PROBLEM

[**Dr. N. B. Parulekar's** series of articles on "Renascent India" in our last volume has been widely appreciated and quoted by several periodicals. He is now the Editor of a daily paper, called *Sakal*, which he has started in Poona.

In this article Dr. Parulekar looks into the future and raises some important issues on which there may be differences of opinion, but the significance of which none can deny. During the war the issues of peace were obscured, neglected even when perceived, and the world of to-day suffers therefrom. Let not India repeat the mistake. The emancipation begotten of the political struggle will have its grave problems, and their solution ought to be the subject of thought and quiet discussion even now.—EDS.]

Once India is free and the present political atmosphere becomes clear, the question will arise, which way will the country shape itself ? Is it to be Gandhi's India, Jawaharlal's, Shaukat Ali's, Malaviya's or Moonje's ?—very different Indias indeed.

Still more there is another India —Young India, consisting of men of this and the coming generation. Their energies are directed towards shaping the future of this country while the present generation of leaders are about to retire. I have seen young men during the last year and a half engaged in social work or political demonstration, in towns and villages. I have seen them toil and suffer as volunteers. I have asked myself if they have a vision of the India they are struggling for. A few of them are University trained; many have had to leave school early; and the large majority is without even elementary education. They are drawn from different communities——Brahmins, non-Brahmins, untouchables, Muslims, Sikhs, Jains, and the number of the fair sex is not negligible. They all seem unaffected by caste rules or religious denominations. This is the army of New India. It is made up of young recruits who have broken old-world bonds, have freed themselves from conservative moorings and are prepared for anything. They are communists without convictions, socialists without serious thought, revivalists without religion—in short, organisms whose energy is out of all proportion to their insight or understanding.

The political agitation is only a symptom of a series of revolutionary waves about to sweep over the land, which will tear to pieces its time-worn structure ; and there is now available an army of people willing to be their channel. In the past men have been reckoned as of one caste or another, who have worshipped or failed to worship this or that form of deity. Many had an occupation of some kind, and the unemployed attributed their misfortune to fate and not to any fault in social organisation. But the incessant political

agitation of more than half a century; increased unemployment among the educated; the rise of new industries in unexpected regions and the consequent displacement of labour; its organisation into unions; continuance of economic depletion in favour of a foreign power;—these and other causes have broken the old time human groupings. Caught in the whirl of larger currents men's minds are rapidly gravitating towards influences which are distinctly alien, far off and as yet largely unseen. This is exactly the atmosphere in which revolutions are made. The present political upheaval does not mark the end of a revolution, however orderly. Even in this movement we should have had plenty of violence but for Gandhi, and also the experience of political workers who know that violence is impracticable under present conditions. Though for the time being the wave of restlessness is placed within the bounds of order, yet I am afraid later on thousands will break and in several directions. That the country has so far remained non-violent is an admirable example of inner restraint, probably unparalleled in human history. But the future? Once the personality of Gandhi is removed, or the issue of political freedom is settled, the country will feel the pressure of raw, untutored and reckless energy.

Whether India is politically agitated or is seemingly settled is not so important. In fact the present comparative silence is more eloquent than the erstwhile turmoil. What is significant and what should be disconcerting to the orthodox as well as progressive elements in the country is the plasticity in men's thinking, a kind of formlessness as in protoplasmic existence which in earlier stages is more active in its tail than its head. The problem is how this head is going to be shaped; what are to be its contents; what ideas are to lodge therein? What, in brief, is to be the direction of conduct of the nation, once it starts as a free unit? Just now in the curvature of its cranium are cast two cells, one of non-violence, and the other of service to the poor. But our national metabolism is in such a crudely formative period that it is not unlikely if the higher strains get twisted later on by opportunism on the one hand and class struggle on the other. Once the emotion fluid, floating round these higher ideas, dries up (and it is sure to dry soon) what possibility is there that such principles will flourish without being dominated by mere biological propensities to live? In other words the struggle for existence is becoming so sharp that there is no knowing to what extent the nation may go.

This need not presuppose any very large mass revolution in the immediate future. The vast majority is still illiterate, still rooted to the soil, still immersed in its rural environment and its own quiet way of thinking. There is still some time before the starving rural population will

pick up their hatchets and march on Government House! To the majority of them the present struggle is not so much for popular rule as for Gandhi rule. They follow him for saintliness first, and for Swaraja afterwards. The farmers in Bardoli told me that they would pay the land revenue if Gandhi would ask them. "Supposing he asks you to pay and you are not able to pay, what will you do?" I asked many, and they could not answer. I am mentioning Bardoli because it has been the base of operation in times of non-cooperation, and had more contacts with Gandhi and his followers than other parts of India. Yet in Bardoli I was not able to find political, social, or economic, consciousness to measure with the no-tax campaign. Those who insisted on Swaraj seem to have no clear ideas whether that Swaraj is to be communistic, capitalistic, socialistic, or individualistic as in old monarchies.

During an election in England when the Socialists were fighting for political supremacy as against the Conservatives, I saw a British audience swayed by promises of more cabbage, corned beef, milk, new tenement houses, etc. During two presidential elections and scores of city or gubernatorial elections in America I found the same thing. If that is the "horse sense" among the English or the Americans, the "cow sense" of the Indian cultivator may not be expected to rise much higher. But what is rising in India, and disproportionately restless to the background of the masses, is a class of people who are out to act,—to change, to break up, either because they have nothing to lose or everything to gain. Just now all are equally animated with a spirit of opportunism which has created an alliance between them instead of a conflict as might have been expected. The more active elements have had some taste of electioneering, and an acquaintance of power through group manipulation. The moneyed are getting rapidly acquainted with larger profits of modern machine methods and want to make more money. The educated unemployed are looking out for more posts. And so on. In other words, with the advent of political freedom and economic indifference to Indian enterprise as its corollary, new avenues to power are being opened up. Add to this the crumbling of caste, which held India in as tight a grip as the church held medieval Europe. After the collapse of the ecclesiastical authority in Europe, passions which for centuries had been locked up leapt with added buoyancy, and a new man was born, a man of unrestrained passions, blind emotions and raw instincts. For over five hundred years Europe tried to guide the emotional current into some form of philosophy, ethics, politics and social organisation, without much success. Science contributed its quota towards the strengthening of individualism. The problem of undigested power is the

problem of modern Europe.

Just as the quest after power has carried Europe through a series of revolutions, it may carry India the same way. Signs are not wanting of this new trend. As already remarked a new philosophy of opportunism has sprung into being, and divergent elements are joining cause, and no single class feels itself strong enough to override the other. The rank and file of the national movement is made up of these: socialists, communists, capitalists, fascists, political idealists, and exponents of policies incompatible with one another, except under forced circumstances as at present. The orthodox and the atheist are brothers! They fight for Congress posts even before Congress is in control of political power. An editor of an important nationalist paper told me this: "Whether we like it or not, our paper represents Congress to-day; whether we like it or not, it will also represent Congress to-morrow, when Congress is the government." Who then is to represent the people when between the Congress as a government and the people the interests begin to diverge?

Some questions here arise for the thinking mind.

Have all Nationalist newspapers which have profited largely by the boycott of their British adversaries, and which condemn in their Editorials a foreign government's attitude towards the poor and the down-trodden, and write columns on what should be done —have all such papers, I ask, a clean sheet as regards the rate of wages they pay their employees and the regularity of their payments?

Can all manufactories of Indian products, products recommended by revered Nationalist leaders and thus appealing to the Indian public, manufactories which have profited also by the boycott of British goods, show an honest record that their employees have participated in the profit or that all the gain has not gone into the pockets of the already rich?

They have not, and they cannot if all that I have been told and have observed is true. In these and like instances is there not a combination of the moneyed and the clever to exploit public sentiment and earn profit in a changing world?

In legislatures, in university senates, academic councils, in elective bodies, how many are there who work disinterestedly for the public? How many who seek profit or power without service or responsibility? The prophet of Swaraj may live on goat's milk but the "nationalist" profiteer will have his cream. Look at the fate of certain labour unions in India. Some of their leaders profess allegiance to Moscow and others to Berlin, and pull down one another, and appropriate to themselves the profit of labour union fees, prestige and power. That is what I have heard.

The stake in India is not so much freedom as philosophy of life, not so much politics as the

question of practical idealism. What chances for an understanding large enough to digest the new power instead of being driven by it to rivalry, self-aggrandisement and to slavery of passions? Unless India is able to hold to a conception of life, to a philosophy organising our scattered interests and activities, it is difficult to see how the country is going to harness the flood of new energies falling into its lap, and utilise them for good rather than be crushed by them. To those who can profit by other people's experience the West lies open to view like a vast mirror reflecting frustrated human efforts. There, now, men feel broken, fatigued and bewildered because the conquest of nature has not brought them nearer to the control of themselves. India is where the West was three hundred years ago, at the beginning of industrial civilisation, and in a period of readjustment of old and new powers. The technique of organising governmental power took centuries of patient labour, research, and heroic struggle for the West, and the experience is lying ready-made at our feet.

Shri Aurobindo Ghose in his first speech at Uttarapara after a year's imprisonment said that he realised God in jail. The magistrate, the police, the bars of the cell, appeared to him to be a play of God. From jail he brought out the message of Dharma, which he said was to be the primary care of India and the basis of her political and economic progress. It was practically the same teaching which Bipin Chandra Pal gave his countrymen after coming out of Buxar jail. During six years of exile Lokamanya Tilak devoted himself to study and explain the philosophy of the *Gita* and the outcome was his *Gita-Rahasya*. The same might be said of Mr. C. R. Das. Put by the side of these men the mentality of the A and B class prisoners in the recent civil disobedience movement and one realises the change. *It is one of the most remarkable phenomena in contemporary India how the very soul of Gandhi's teaching seems to pass unheeded by his educated countrymen. He preaches non-violence as a principle; they follow it as a policy.* I have had several opportunities of observing Gujerat, the province of Gandhi. Young college men in Gujerat (I am informed by those who are supposed to know them) read more Bertrand Russell and Bernard Shaw than Gandhi; believe in birth-control when he preaches self-control; are drawn to novels and motion pictures of western social life as against Gandhi's own social philosophy. I have had opportunities to travel, see, talk with people and observe with my own eyes all over India during the last eighteen months. Everywhere I found the same story of the rise of individualism. Young men are adrift, and the question is, what is to be their philosophy? Educational institutions under the auspices of religious bodies, *i. e.*, organisations expressly planned

to promote spiritual progress, such as Arya Samaj, Brahmo Samaj, Hindu or Moslem denominational groups, including Benares Hindu University, are turning out hundreds of young men without an impress of the very philosophy they were founded to promote.

What India needs to develop in order to cope with the unfolding new powers, is a philosophy of renunciation. The ascetic ideal germane to Hindu civilisation needs to be rescued, on the one hand, from those who have made of it a kind of ritualism or religious extravaganza, and on the other from a generation of men whose major efforts are directed to accumulate power over others or material wealth to satisfy themselves. Hungry and now free to choose their own pace of progress—that is what the impending political freedom, coupled with the influx of machines and mechanical knowledge from the West, means to the more active, ambitious and acquisitive elements. What about the illiterate, rural population? They may be hoping to plunge headlong into material prosperity.

The edifice of material civilisation can be raised in India as high as elsewhere—by increasing human wants. It is easy to raise men's standard of living without necessarily raising thereby the standard of thinking. This must put the entire spiritual life of the country at stake. The other way is to cultivate the virtue of disinterestedness, of nonpossession, and the desire to create without the corresponding desire to possess for oneself. It is not mere altruism either that is wanted. It means that the initiative must come from a desire to transcend life rather than simply to enjoy it. There is a kind of asceticism that runs away from the world. There is another, one that is brought out most systematically in the teaching of the *Gita*:—a religiously scrupulous discipline of putting Soul above senses, understanding above acquisition, and a discrimination between what is permanent and what is impermanent though extremely attractive for the time being. *It is by sowing the seeds of sacrifice in the fields of material science, government, business, in fact, every department of life, that we may hope to grow a spiritual civilisation in India.* Otherwise there will be a harvest of madness for power, pleasure and material expansion. What is really at stake in India is the very existence of its ancient philosophy; also—the chance it may have in the new era now about to dawn.

N. B. PARULEKAR

RHYTHM AND LIFE

[**Sir Herbert Barker** is a specialist in manipulative surgery, who champions the cause of bloodless methods of operating. It is reported that "he showed marked ability when quite a child for manipulative surgery";—is this indicative of knowledge brought back from a former incarnation? His principal operations are directed to the radical cure of derangement of knee cartilages without surgical interference, the correction of flat-foot, and other kinds of abnormality of the joints. He is said to have successfully treated over 40,000 cases.—EDS.]

Modern science has undergone a complete revolution since the days when Huxley, the great Victorian, interpreted the phenomena of the external world in such terms that it seemed the last stronghold of Nature's secrets had been wrested from her.

To our fathers it was as though the whole anatomy of the universe had been dissected out and laid bare for our inspection. The universe was presented to our minds as a vast structure of atomic bricks indestructible and everlasting.

All that has gone. Modern science, particularly astro-physics, has undergone a change that is little short of amazing. For the truth is clear: the physicist of today is a mystic. He sees the universe through the eyes of the visionary. To his cold science has been added that intangible something that carries the searcher after truth over from the category of fact collector to interpreter and seer.

A second change, no less remarkable, has transformed our ideas concerning the internal world of mind. If the external universe about us has unfolded before our prying eyes mystery upon mystery, vastness upon vastness, the exploration of the human mind has done no less.

Psychology reveals us to ourselves. And the discovery is a marvel as great as that of Darien to old Cortes. We behold our minds in awe and amazement, for what we see is a universe housed in the bony structure of the skull, where the mathematical formula that the less cannot contain the greater is set at naught.

In these two realms, the external universe in which our small celestial home whirls amid a million silent, unknown, and maybe, unknowable neighbours, and the internal universe of mind, we dimly sense certain laws.

The dance of the stars, the gyrations of the unnumbered Solar systems of space, constitute a rhythm. The physical universe is a symphony. Its music is subject to rules even as are the symphonies of Beethoven. There is a counterpoint and harmony in the heavens above and in the earth beneath the heavens.

Nor is this all. There is a rhythm in the human mind and in the human heart, just as there is a rhythm in every movement of body or mind. This, if I may

be permitted the term, I would call the Rhythm of Life or Life's Dance.

The problem of all intelligent life on earth is the problem of achieving physical and spiritual harmony with environment. It is, in a word, first recognition of the fact of life's rhythm, and thereafter of the mastery of its very difficult technique.

In the East, among Yogis, the cult of rhythmic life has been studied far more seriously than has been the case with the western world. The reason for this is not far to seek. Speaking very generally, however, it may be said that the Eastern mind is introvert, the Western extravert. The introvert looks in upon the realm of personality, the individual soul, and explores its vast and bewildering hinterland. From that Odyssey of the Spirit has come much that is of supreme value to humanity.

For dimly the central fact defines itself to the human consciousness. It is this: life is not the scattered fragments of a shattered mosaic: life is one and whole, its parts interrelated and interdependent.

Thus self-examination reveals to us the truth that there can be no health of the physical body without health of the soul: that each acts upon the other by some intangible agency of sympathy or harmonics. This restatement of the problem of wholeness, or health, casts a white light upon the manifold evils that beset man as individual and man as social animal.

The disorders that afflict and mar the lives of the majority of mankind arise from lack of rhythm in life. That rhythm, or lack of rhythm, is the governing factor of our existences from the moment of conception to the final dissolution, so-called death.

It is a startling suggestion to put forth, yet one that is well worth considering, that no man can live rhythmically unless he follows the first cardinal law of life, which is to breathe scientifically.*

The mind is not the brain, but the brain is the instrument of the mind and conditions its activities. The body is not the soul, but it is the house of the soul and conditions the soul's growth. Both brain and body, then, fed by the blood-stream, call for those conditions that ensure health.

There is no escape from life's rhythm: it is the universal harmony. The very blood-stream itself is a rhythm, rhythm of heart beat, rhythm of red and white blood cell.

Space forbids further elaboration of that aspect of our subject. It may be summed up with the proposition that health and holiness are allied.

*Like all other bodily processes, breathing is but an outward expression of an inner and psychological action. Hatha-yogis teach sundry practices for "killing" breath; there are westerners who thoughtlessly practise and advocate practice of breathing exercise—dangerous alike to mind and body. When the mental energies are creative in the spiritual sense, bodily breathing naturally becomes rhythmic. Theosophy which teaches the eastern Raja-Yoga methods, advocates not lung breathing, but mental *will* breathing; the difference between the two is enormous. Real Esoteric or Raja-Yoga instructions are not to be found in printed books; they are imparted to the pupil, who has prepared himself, by a real Guru.—EDS.

Turn to the consideration of the modern world expressed in the feverish activities of an age pledged to the Moloch of acquisitiveness, and we find an implicit denial of the central truth of our existence: we find everywhere discord, disharmony.

That is the malady of the modern world; its life is febrile, unorganized, empirical. Yet the social activities of man, no less than his physical mechanism and its scientific control, are part of the general life rhythm. The modern world is coloured by a false philosophy, and, starting from that false approach, it blunders from chaos and confusion to fearful dilemmas from which the wit of man seems impotent to save it.

Yet the reason, it seems to me, is obvious. There is no rhythm in a social system based upon the acquisitive instinct, for such a system mars the harmony of daily life by muting the chords of man's spiritual organ. In place of the Dance of Life we see a frenzied stampede whose urge is fear, distrust and greed.

The essence of our task is to master the theory of life's harmony, for lacking it, we may hope to produce nothing better than discord. The philosophy of life that places in so many watertight compartments human activities is self-condemned because a self-evident failure in operation.

All man's social and political activities must be capable of expression in moral terms. For behind all lies the spiritual law, the law that can be interpreted and applied only in action.

The false aim begets the false end. There can be no health without knowledge, no knowledge without wisdom, no wisdom without rhythm, no rhythm without love.

And love is the law.

The individual who loves, whether that love be the love of man for woman, or the generalized love of the individual for his kind, or the impersonal love of man for the Deity, experiences the true and inner meaning of rhythm. The ecstatic moment brings self-fulfilment and the opening of magic doors.

It is only necessary to study the lives of the holy men of all times, of Jesus and St. Francis, or Gautama the Buddha, or the Mahatmas and Yogis, to realize that these great Spirits have expressed in every thought, deed and movement the outward and visible sign of an inward harmony.

Through all the universe ripples the Eternal Rhythm of life, majestic and symphonic. Rhythm of light rays, of sound rays, of electrical energy, of physical tissues, of mental and spiritual energy.

The tendency of modern science is away from materialism and towards mysticism. Behind phenomena lies Mind: and at the central core of all, the fountain-head, the law and the code: ABSOLUTE COMPASSION.

HERBERT BARKER

THE SONG OF THE MIDLAND SEA

[**Robert Sencourt** is the author of *The Life of Empress Eugénie*, *The Life of George Meredith*, *Outflying Philosophy*, and *India in English Literature*. He at one time lived in India for four years, and has spent an equal period in Italy and France. In the following article he makes a plea for a blending of the intellectual and spiritual ideas of East and West which meet in the waters of the Mediterranean.—EDS.]

I

In the things both of the mind and of the spirit, the Mediterranean is still the world's central sea. It washes three continents, it is half way between the equator and the pole; Rome, its central city, is equidistant from Aberdeen and Erzerum, from Timbuctoo, Khartoum and Petrograd, from Delhi and Newfoundland, from Chicago and Mandalay. Its temperate air, its soft yet brilliant light, its green and violet waters, its azure skies, have urged on men a love of luminous air which has enabled them to use the images of nature for more ethereal realities. Therefore also they hold the balance between the senses and the spirit; and as they are poised between intellect and blood, so also their civilization amalgamates the Eastern with the Western World. The dominant civilizations of the German and the English speaking peoples have turned towards the organization and division of material production, and the general provision of material comfort against harsh extremes of climate, and depressing atmospheres; the older and more venerable cultures of India, Japan and China have paused in compromise between the onrush of this material civilization, and their immemorial assertion of religious ideals as absolute; Russia, in a sudden and impressive upheaval, has turned from the resigned spiritual patience of the East to the organized materialism of the West in its most logical, most mechanical and most aggressive form; but the Mediterranean to-day, as for at least three thousand years, and perhaps further still into "the dark backward and abysm of time" has been struggling to maintain even in social and political organizations a just balance between order and freedom, as it does also between eternal things and present well-being. It would never do so if its waters did not wash on oriental shores, as well as on those which lead up to the modern productive North. It would never do so but that its traditions contain what the spiritual philosophy of India has handed down from what Burke called "the earliest twilight of moral and metaphysical thought".

For between Benares and Damascus, where the road turns upwards towards Athens and downwards towards Jerusalem and Egypt, what immemorial caravans have passed! Sometimes the

snow and the declivity of the mountains; sometimes "the rose red city half as old as time" with its terraced outline which shows its hovels and its palaces open to the escape and refuge of the roof; sometimes the river and the palm, sometimes the cypress and the rose, led them over the jungle and the desert in their pilgrimage through intense and brilliant light. And were there also sacred caravans that moved alone beneath the stars? We do not know. There is no detailed record of an exchange between religions or philosophies. Before Alexander crossed the Indus and invaded the territories of Porus, Scylax of Caryanda had been sent to India by Darius; before 500 B. C. Hecataeus of Miletus published a book of ancient geography which gave many details of India among which there seems to be a mention of Buddhism, and of an elaborate social system under an organized bureaucracy; but Megasthenes, who went as Ambassador to Chandragupta in Pataliputra, gave the fullest account of India which the Greek world ever had. Chandragupta was a sovereign whose court was gorgeous and whose administration was elaborately organized; he had the dervish and fakir among his subjects; but there is no record that there was any real interchange of thought or spiritual mysticism; for the clearest hint of intellectual interchange is the record of an Indian who sent to Greece asking for "some raisins and a sophist". Nevertheless, *it is at Athens that the truths of Eastern religion became the mother of all succeeding thought in the Western world.*

II

What is truth? What is reality? That was the great question which invited the sublimest researches of ancient wisdom. It is true that man is a creature of the senses, and lives by his contact with the exterior world: but in his inner world—the mind of man contemplating—he has another realm and a more august one; for the mind which understands insists that it has within itself the criterion and measure of reality. Shelley, dreamily watching the reflection of the sun from the lake playing on the ivy and the yellow bees busy with its bloom, claimed that from them he could create a form immortal, a form more real than man. So the philosopher says: thought ever works with forms, which—if not more real than man—are man's own true reality. Man's reason is not bounded by itself; and still less by material things. It can insist that within its intercourse with them it lives with an independent life; that its thought is a form; and that this unseen form or idea is alone valid to the supreme and indestructible reality.

What then is the meaning of the outward world? To the Hindu philosophy it had seemed but delusion, and Plato too was content to call it a shadow; absorption in it was therefore but the dream of a shadow, and the art which reproduced it the shadow of a

shadow. This doctrine of Plato's is one of the highest flights of oriental thought through the azure deeps of air as it wings its way from matter to that which is beyond it. But had it stopped at the oriental tradition with Plato, life on earth would have been meaningless: and the men of the Mediterranean did not cease to be men of earth. Plato was hardly dead, when Aristotle his pupil gave a new turn to the whole meaning of western philosophy. Less of a poet, less of a dreamer, he accepted that doctrine of Ideas in which Plato expressed the wisdom of the East; but he could not deny the outward world. Aristotle did not say that God is a thinker apart from what He thinks: but that thought which is a Divine activity, thought itself, illuminating the life of man, enables man to abstract from the things he knows by sense a contact with something indestructible, something of ultimate reality, something which, being unseen and recognized by thought not sight, is eternal. The things which are recognized by sight, though not actually delusion, are so fragile, so transitory that they claim no more reality than sense can give them. The senses recognize only the temporal or accidental appearance which they have: but their reality, which both Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy call their substance, or substantial form, is something underlying this, something which relates them to man's judgment, something they owe to their correspondence with informing and timeless thought: and recognizing so the scenes of nature which he loves, the philosopher may repeat what Wordsworth said of his own joy among them

> I held unconscious intercourse with beauty
> Old as creation.

Thought, said Aristotle, was ever creative, and draws the forms of all things out of abysmal void. In the beginning was a Mind, and beside it there was nothing: and yet this void of nothing, this blind vacancy, was a raw material, a chaos out of which order could be evolved, a night which could be illumined. It was so that Aristotle found a reality (though an inferior reality) in the outward world which was informed by creative thought; as a sculptor can make the unhewn stone instinct with ideal life.

So much is philosophy: and it is a philosophy which cannot but be congenial to the great traditions of India. And indeed it is not complete till it meets the traditions of India: for even to the present day, this great tradition which never died, and which has come again to a new and vigorous youth, has not explained and cannot explain what is the relation between the life of sense and the life of mind. It can be explained only by the postulate of a nature which partakes of both, of something between the body and the mind and which interpenetrates them both. Such an energy, invisible like electricity, yet like electricity able to affect material forms, is known to India, which in its account of the various energies or

bodies in which man ascends from the life of physical nature to the highest powers and faculties of the soul is one to which the Mediterranean philosophy is now about to turn.

III

Philosophy in its noblest exercise is always merging into mysticism.

"By mysticism" said Jowett, the great authority on Plato, "we mean not the extravagance of an erring fancy but the concentration of reason in feeling, the enthusiastic love of the good, the true, the one, the sense of the infinity of knowledge and the marvel of the human faculties." When life becomes thus full of high emprise, it is, as we say, inspired by something higher than itself. The activity of mind, in other words, has been raised to that of spirit. For what is the intellectual illustration which gives to all things their intelligible splendour? The final idea of good or truth or beauty is no quiescent form: it is a power of light and life and love. And this supernal energy, working together on heart and mind and soul, arouses the sense and faculty of mysticism by which human life not merely in the exercise of thought but by a spiritual faculty which turns the life of the heart to a profound movement of unity enters by instinct and intuition into communion with the life which is divine.

Such a life, it is true, is founded in moral law: and it cannot be divorced from man's duties and responsibilities in the natural sphere which indeed it energises and illumines. But it looks beyond them; its object is to unite man, and all his faculties, with that Divine Life which seen by the philosophers as the thought of the original mind is now perceived also as perfect love; it says to the created heart "a heart beats here": and heart and mind together combining in one act of loving intuition see this perfection as coming in a loving embrace to unite with the life of nature, and draw it up into its own holy and supernal life—for such is the sense of the Christian mystery. They see it therefore at once as very near, nearer than hands or feet, and see it also far off as the heavenly beauty, a beauty which in Dante's words is joy:

una bellezza
Che letizia era.

Such a beauty is so far more than the eye has seen, or the heart conceived, that it is attained only by the negation of the life of sense, only when the soul lives in its transcendent faculties. Here is the all, which to the lower sense is nothing. A Renaissance saint of old Castile, John of the Cross, wrote more than one treatise to speak of the dark night, first of the senses, then of the soul, through which he passed by the negation of desire into this nothing and this all which, often misunderstood, had appeared more than two thousand years before him to the disciple of Buddha. Spain itself though at the Western Gateway of the Mediterranean which

passed out to the old fabled continent of Atlantis was a country steeped in the traditions of the Orient, not only in the Christian mysteries but in many subtle influences from Islam. It is one of the latest triumphs of Spanish scholarship, the discovery of Professor Asin y Palacios of Madrid, that not only did the concept of an ideal human passion such as that of Dante for Beatrice, come not from the Provençal troubadours, and so from beyond the Rhine, but that it was taught explicitly by Ibn Arabi of Murcia. This Moslem had anticipated, and no doubt informed, Dante on practically every detail in which up to now we had thought the Divine Poet was most original.

England has given to India the material advantages of her own contribution to civilization: and with that the Pax Britannica. *But is it not true of modern civilization that it sacrifices life to the appurtenances of life*? Britain's gift to India, which at its best is excellent, is at its best only as a means for an assimilation between Indian ideals and the mystical and philosophical traditions of the Mediterranean by which all that is finest, even in British life, is inspired. The commerce in material things which attracted the Elizabethan traders has done good in its own sphere: but it must tend to make way for the generative intercourse of philosophy and religion. That mutual attraction and affinity can lead to the fruitfulness of romantic union only when India has refined and enriched the Mediterranean traditions of the inner life. So in their mutual richness Eastern and Western wisdom will mingle and interweave with the sympathy which has the vibrant potency of music and is "nowhere to be defined but in strange melodies".

But until India can assist it more precisely

> to unfold
> What worlds and what vast regions hold
> The immortal mind

the heart and soul of Europe cannot take flight in those great adventures of spiritual love, which refine the magnetism of the blood with intuitive sympathies in which, as by an outpouring of aromatic gums and juices, the glowing heart of India leaps up to perfume and to flame. It is because this new and sacred commerce can live only in mutual trust and generosity that England must forego the constraint which irks the Indian soul. And India for her part needs England as a means to something more than England, to the origin and sunrise of European wisdom. The time has come for us to pass above the impressive pageant of human life, as we see it in Shakespeare, to Dante's

> Tales and golden histories
> Of heaven and its mysteries.

The Divine Poet, in wedding the ethereal beauty of the Italian scene to the holiest traditions of his culture, guides us upward to the beauty of the arcaner spheres of which the immemorial science of the soul in India has spoken with such exquisite precision.

ROBERT SENCOURT

KARMA AS A THEORY OF CAUSATION

[**Dr. Jagadisan M. Kumarappa** has the advantage of belonging to the Indian nation which inherits Karma as a belief; but he was born in a well-known Christian family and was thus, in a sense, kept aloof from it. His philosophical study, therefore, leads him to examine this doctrine in a way which is neither that of the orthodox Hindu, nor of the heterodox alien. He presents thoughts which the reader can develop. In a second article, he will give the psychological aspect of the Great Law as it affects the individual.

H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* (I, 634-635) has the following:—

> The ONE LIFE is closely related to *the one* law which governs the World of Being—KARMA. Exoterically, this is simply and literally "action," or rather an "effect-producing cause." Esoterically it is quite a different thing in its far-fetching moral effects. It is the unerring LAW OF RETRIBUTION. To say to those ignorant of the real significance, characteristics and awful importance of this eternal immutable law, that no theological definition of a personal deity can give an idea of this impersonal, yet ever present and active Principle, is to speak in vain. Nor can it be called Providence. For Providence, with the Theists (the Christian Protestants, at any rate), rejoices in a personal male gender, while with the Roman Catholics it is a female potency, "Divine Providence tempers His blessings to secure their better effects," Wogan tells us. Indeed "He" tempers them, which Karma—a sexless principle—does not. . . . . At the first flutter of renascent life, Svâbhâvat, "the mutable radiance of the Immutable Darkness unconscious in Eternity," passes, at every new rebirth of Kosmos, from an inactive state into one of intense activity; that it differentiates, and then begins its work through that differentiation. This work is KARMA. —EDS.]

A battle of opinions is now raging in the West around the law of causality which, until recently, was accepted as a fundamental axiom in physical science. Does the principle of causation, as hitherto believed, hold good in all its force for every physical happening and for every detail of such happening? Or has it only a summary and statistical significance? If we assume the law of strict dynamic causality as existing throughout the universe, could we logically exclude the human will from its operation? These and other allied questions are now engaging the attention of Western scholars, but the mixing up of the mathematical idea of determinism which arises from the notion of order in nature, and the purely metaphysical idea of a fundamental reason or cause which accounts for and determines the existence of everything in the universe, has produced the confusion which characterizes the present discussions on the subject. Nevertheless, the recent controversy has led some scientists to declare that the development of physical science points directly and distinctly to one comprehensive and unifying law of nature, and that the discovery of this law will help us to find the bond which holds the world structure together. Hence

there has come about a general feeling that the principle of causality could not be admitted in the sense in which it was accepted until recent times, and that, if this law is to be that unifying principle, it must then be shown to operate as dynamically in the spiritual and moral worlds as it operates in the physical realm. Since more or less the same problem challenged the ancient thinkers of India, it may not be out of place to enquire if India has any suggestion to offer in this direction.

What then is the theory of causation as put forth by Indian philosophers? According to them the Law of Karma is the causal law. If in the physical world Karma holds good as the law of cause and effect, does it operate with equal force in the spiritual and the moral world as well? In answer to this question, it may be said that it is precisely this comprehensiveness that has provided the Law of Karma with its most distinctive feature. What then is this Law? The Karmic law, which is the source, origin and fount of all other laws existing throughout nature, is the ultimate law of the universe. And even more, it is that law which rigidly and unerringly adjusts effect to cause on the physical, mental and spiritual planes of being.* This description of the law makes it quite clear that nothing is exempt from the operation of Karma which, like Fate in Greek Mythology, standing even above Jupiter, exercises a paramount sway over everything human or divine. It is, in fact, this bold claim of Karma, namely, that cause and effect are as inseparably linked in the spiritual and moral worlds as science assumes them to be in the physical world, that makes its main appeal to the modern mind.

Brahman or Deity is the real from which this world of manifestation has come into being.† The souls of men are but sparks‡ of this Great Spirit, the Imperishable One, and Karma is part of Its divine nature. In the mind of this Deity exist, as archetypal ideas, all possibilities of existence, owing their being to It and sharing Its eternity. And that which is the link in the divine mind between all the thought-forms It emanates in the universe is the Karma that is eternal, and the succession of these as they exist for our limited minds under the conditions of space and time, is the Karma in time. It is the latter we call the principle of causality as one follows the other in definite order. Karma, having no beginning, manifests itself in time only when the conditions for its manifestation are present. And this principle of Karma, when looked at from the point of view of philosophy, is concerned, we may say, with the causes of existence,—not only the physical causes known to science, but also the metaphysical causes, the most

* H. P. Blavatsky, *The Key to Theosophy*, p. 167. [Indian Edition]
† *Mundaka Upanishad*, I. i, 8-9.
‡ Ibid, II, i. I.

outstanding of which is Desire.* But the real cause of that "desire to exist" escapes man's intellectual scrutiny. However, Buddhist philosophy, by tracing it back to its original source, has given us what is known as the Twelve Nidanas or the chief causes of existence which are linked as follows:—

From ignorance come the dispositions which lead to rebirth.
From the dispositions come our consciousness or cognition.
From consciousness come name and form (*i. e.*, personality).
From name and form come the five senses and the mind.
From the five senses and the mind comes contact.
From contact comes feeling or sensation.
From feeling comes craving or desire.
From craving comes grasping or attachment to existence.
From grasping comes becoming.
From becoming comes birth.
From birth comes old age.
From old age comes sorrow, sickness and death.

This is known as the Twelve-linked Chain of Causation. Each is the effect of its antecedent cause, and a cause, in its turn, to its successor. In this causal chain, it must be noted, there are three periods, Ignorance and Dispositions appertain to the Past; Birth, Old Age and Death to the Future, and the other eight intervening links to the Present. It may perhaps be better expressed thus:—

A. The Past Causes and the Present Effects.

1.	Ignorance	The Past Causes
2.	Dispositions	
3.	Consciousness	The Present Effects
4.	Name and Form	
5.	The Five Senses and the Mind	
6.	Contact	
7.	Feeling	

B. The Present Causes and the Future Effects.

8.	Desire	The Present Causes
9.	Grasping	
10.	Existence	
11.	Birth	The Future Effects
12.	Old Age and Death	

The Twelve Nidanas, which are based merely on the facts of experience, describe a wheel of existence, bringing out clearly the fact that sentient existence is bound up inextricably with ignorance and therefore with sin and naturally therefore with sorrow. Each new birth leaves the individual ignorant and finite, and his *samskâras* or actions condition the continuity of his existence in this whirl of constant changes. In the world of impermanence the law of change or causality is the supreme reality, and as such this Buddhist doctrine deals with the variety of changeable phenomena. Nothing is permanent except, of course, the one hidden absolute existence, the Unchangeable, which contains in itself the noumena of all realities. Though there is no provision in this theory for an all-sustaining Being, yet such a being is not excluded from the scheme altogether. In fact it is only the assumption of the Ever-Existent that gives completeness and meaning to this dynamic conception of reality which reduces everything to force and movements.

Though Brahman, the One Universal Life, is the self of us all and we fragments of the divine

* *Rigveda* X, 129, 4.

Spirit, our consciousness has become separated from each other by the separation of the matter to which each fragment of divinity is linked. In the process of evolution,* consciousness has been slowly moving upwards from the lowest stage by appropriating more and more matter to itself for greater expression or activity. This movement of consciousness may be traced through the vegetable kingdom to the animal kingdom, and through the animal to the animal-man and then to the human —and it is here that individualization takes place—thus marking the different stages in the evolutionary process. This course of development does not end here. These individual human beings, who have thus come under the operation of the law of Karma, can evolve further and appear gradually as supermen. In this manner they can move on and on to attain to the state of divine Spirit from whence they streamed forth. Therefore the ego in the Karana Sharira or causal body,† being only a temporary expression of that Eternal Self,—which is man's real life,—awaits its time to realize once again its unity with the Infinite.

How then is this unity to be achieved? Since this situation has been brought about by breaking up the homogeneity between the two natures—the terrestrial and the divine—it can only be restored by re-establishing the broken oneness. Unfortunately, however, this is impossible of accomplishment within the short space of a single life. Hence living beings are obliged to ever whirl round and round in this wheel of birth and death. But existence in this world, or rather the struggle of man to maintain his individuality, is something not only to be dreaded but also to be ended, for it entails upon man misery and pain, growth and decay. But then, does not death put an end to existence? Oh no! To destroy it, death is absolutely powerless; in fact, it serves as an exit to pass from one life to another life on earth. If even death cannot deliver man from it, how then is he to escape suffering,—the inalienable condition of existence? Is man to be eternally riveted to life? If not, how can he get rid of the transiency of life and its incidental vicissitudes? Though the pain of Samsâra (the circuit of life) is due to causes contained in the previous existence, yet only on the surface is man the creature of his Karma and lies under its dreadful power; for, ultimately this Karma, which drives him from birth to birth, is nothing but the product of his own making. And so, what he has created, luckily for him, he can also destroy.

By exercising his power, man can overcome Karma and even liberate himself from its many

* For a fuller treatment of the evolution of consciousness see *Taittirîya Upanishad*, II and III.

† This term has been misunderstood and misused in pseudo-theosophy. The reader will find a correct rendering of it in the works of H. P. Blavatsky.

bonds. Therefore the best way out is to break the chain, to attain to a condition that will not only be outside the reach of the curse of change but contain within itself the element of finality. By extinguishing the three-fold craving,—the lust of the flesh, the lust of the world and the pride of life and their most immediate results, the inward fires of passion, hatred and delusion,—he can attain, of course, that state of mind where desire is no more. And when that stage is reached there will be no more formation of new links, and consequently no more rebirths. Such dominion over one's self can only be acquired through knowledge or such enlightenment* as came to Buddha. But so long as ignorance blinds man, so long he will remain bound. He must seek therefore to transform ignorance into knowledge, for it is knowledge that makes man master of his Karma by emancipating the soul from the sufferings of rebirth and dispelling the fruits of Ignorance, Desire and Illusion.

Though reincarnation, from the point of view of suffering, is something to be dreaded, yet, when looked at as a means to spiritual evolution, it is something to be desired. The idea of being born again and again in order to grow spiritually and enrich and supplement our early experience is certainly an attractive conception. But then, asks one, is there memory of any previous existence for the purpose of enlarging and improving the present life by former experiences? Though our consciousness may not testify to it, there is a real connection of cause and effect between the present and past life of the same individual. In fact, Karma is not concerned so much with the continuance of memory as with the conservation of values. It is what a man does, his Karma† that persists from birth to birth. Since the reality of life is not body or mind but character, it is that that survives the disruption of death and supplies the persisting identity between one life and another. We may therefore say that what really takes place is a "transmigration of character," and that the resulting character builds up a new individuality. While modern science maintains that man inherits his character from his ancestors,—a character which has been gradually formed during a practically endless chain of past existences,—Karma holds that a man's character is inherited, certainly, but not from generations of his ancestors but from himself through an infinite series of his own past existences. Character is after all nothing more than a perfectly educated will, and that is what is necessary for attaining one's salvation through discipline.

The more one lives a life of reason, the more one musters power to subdue matter, and each stage in such a spiritual evolution brings with it an expansion of consciousness, a deeper spiritual

* *Kena Upanishad*, II, 4.

† H. P. Blavatsky, *Theosophical Glossary*, see 173-4.

insight. The higher one rises in the unfolding of consciousness, the greater is one's freedom to manifest one's divine faculties, whatever may be the material form in which one may be clothed. This, in fact, is the purpose of evolution. The history of an individual, therefore, does not really begin at his birth or end with his death. He must be thought of as having been endless generations in the making. Such towering personalities as Jesus and Confucius, Buddha and Lao Tzu, are not the products of a single life or single age. They are men who have evolved from the realm of man to that of superman in the course of these countless births. The manifestation of such figures in history depends upon the gradual and slow evolution of the soul under the operation of the law of Karma. How else could we explain rationally the marvellous phenomenon of a poor carpenter in an obscure corner of Palestine becoming the progenitor of a personality like Jesus of Nazareth whom nearly half the civilized world worships?

When the soul obtains deliverance from the evil of existence by the utter extermination of selfish desire, then it enjoys the calm and peaceful bliss known as Nirvâna or Moksha. When Nirvâna is attained, the ego-personality, which starts its course by becoming linked to matter, comes to an end. Does not Nirvâna then mean total annihilation or non-existence? Not at all; only the life in flesh is ended but life in ideation continues. It is the unreal, according to Indian thought, that has no existence but the real never ceases to be. Existence, which always is, cannot end, and the manifestation of the real in time by its appropriation of matter is only a temporary expression of a supreme individuality. The Eternal is the source of the temporal,* the Uncreated of the created. When the temporal and the created disappear, that which remains is eternal. What began in time must, of course, end in time; but individual selves, as sparks of the Eternal, have neither beginning of days nor end of life. When linked to matter, they come under the law of Karma; when their bonds are broken, they regain their immateriality. Therefore the attainment of Nirvana or Moksha only means that a soul, divested of its separative-consciousness, has ultimately reached the state of its original purity plus the knowledge about it. Karma thus re-establishes the broken homogeneity. As a theory of causation, it solves the great secret or mystery of human destiny in the spiritual world, and gives us a just conception of the rational nature of the mechanism by which the spirit works in this universe.

JAGADISAN M. KUMARAPPA

* *Maitri Upanishad*. vi, 15.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LENIN

[**Mrs. Marion Robinson** was born in Calcutta, and has lived in India for fourteen years—both as a child and after she grew up. She was educated at Cheltenham Ladies' College, and University College, Reading. She has written for *The Adelphi* and other periodicals. We would like to share with our readers the following passage of a letter received from her some months ago:—

"My own belief is that the West has reached a point of over-saturation with a mania for *doing*, and has quite lost sight of *being*; and since what we *do* if it is to be efficacious, needs to be a spontaneous expression of what we *are*, I feel that the sooner the West gets down to the business of finding out what it *is*, and ceases to worry so much about what it *does*, the sooner the general state of affairs will improve. In that respect it has much to learn from the East."—EDS.]

The eyes of the world are upon Russia; everyone who spends a few weeks there hastens to record his personal impressions. The average reader, conscientiously studying these books, grows more and more bewildered; the accounts are so contradictory. What is it all about? And what will be the end of it?

The trouble about most of these writers is that they are recording their own surface impressions, without ever having studied the fundamental principles underlying the Russian experiment. To begin with, almost all of them make the same initial, and disastrous, mistake; they regard Bolshevism as a Russian movement, political and economic; whereas it is an international movement. And if we take our attention off Russia for a moment, and listen to what is going on in other countries, we can hear a faint, but steady murmur, showing that amongst the thinking people in those other countries, the ideas behind it are beginning to make themselves felt. The world is in a critical state; we all realise that. Some of us believe that a crash is imminent; that the present depression differs from previous depressions; that, in a word, Western civilisation has *failed*. And, without depending too much on the success or failure of the Russian experiment as proof, we are beginning to wonder whether the gospel preached by Lenin may not be the one which the world, *at this moment of time*, is needing.

It is almost invariably—perhaps inevitably—the case that the outstanding qualities of great men are not recognised during their lifetime. In the case of Lenin they are not generally recognised even now. Yet anybody who seriously studies his writings and his career, and their essential unity, must realise that, while there were, and are, amongst the Bolshevik leaders many able and purposeful men, there has been amongst them only one outstanding genius; and, furthermore, that Lenin is not merely the outstanding genius of his party and nation, but of the present century.

His actual gospel was very

simple. It was "to end the exploitation of man by man, and to attain Communism, whose law is: 'to everyone according to his needs, from everyone according to his ability'." Which is, surely, the gospel to which every man must subscribe, or declare himself the enemy of humanity. But Lenin also knew very well that it could not be accomplished in a day. "Before revolution," he writes, "we are twitted with being Utopians; after revolution, they demand the immediate disappearance of all remnants of the past régime." And we need to bear that in mind; for it is a warning to us not to judge of the Russian experiment too soon.

Lenin was a communist, out and out. That is to say, he saw—and anybody who studies the great so-called "democracies" and their progress with a critical eye must also see—that socialism of the "national" kind is an impossible, impracticable, and illogical compromise. It is not possible to serve simultaneously God and Mammon; it is not possible to have a capitalist world without exploitation of man by man. For the essence of capitalism is that capital—private capital—shall be remunerated; consequently it is people's money, not their work, which is remunerated. The result is evident to-day in the world depression; goods are produced, and remain unsold; while on the other hand people who need those goods and who would willingly work to win them, are starving and going in rags for want of the wherewithal to buy them. *Money* is the great earner; not work; and since any economic system rests on a principle of value in one kind exchanged against value in a different kind, this system by which money value begets itself is going to its inevitable doom. The clock is running down, and down, and down; the economic system called capitalism is proving a self-destroyer, preying upon its own vitals.

Yet obviously this state of affairs is as unnecessary as it is uneconomic. Tchehov pointed that out long ago:

> If all of us, townspeople and country people, all without exception, would agree to divide between us the labour which mankind spends on the satisfaction of their physical needs, each of us would perhaps need to work only for two or three hours a day...All of us together would devote our leisure to science and art. Just as the peasants sometimes work, the whole community together mending the roads, all of us, as a community, would search for truth and the meaning of life.

Many men have realised that; it has remained for our own time to propound a working theory to attain it. Said Karl Marx: "Philosophers have only explained the world, but the question is, how to alter it." And in Lenin was found the man who combined the capacity to grasp the philosophical importance of these discrepancies and the practical ability to work out a scheme to resolve them. But he has been misinterpreted and misunderstood because his true objects have been lost sight of by men who were not possessed of his own amazing clarity and disinterestedness.

The trouble with our Western world to-day is that for many years past we have been in the grip of a terrible spiritual inertia, due to fear; which, in turn, is due to depreciated vitality. We are the prey of a materialism which crushes our life; our very religion is become material. Yet we have clung desperately to it, forgetting that Jesus, its founder, himself warned us that only by losing ourselves may we find ourselves. *Far better without religion, than with a religion that is sham*; yet the Western world dare not face that fact; and we have to-day the frequent spectacle of men of thought and intellect taking refuge in a form of religion which their minds have outgrown. We have become more and more superficial; have come to accept as ultimate realities mere symbols. Indeed, to touch the trouble at its fundamentals, we have lost sight of the fact that doing is in itself ephemeral; an expression of being, and only so, significant. We have come to live, rootless, on the surface; grandiose schemes of charity, progress and "uplift" are launched; who notices that they are colossal frauds, the fruit of self-love or self-protection rather than genuine altruism? *Hearing that altruism is the supreme virtue, we rush to perform altruistic acts, not realising that they are not merely worthless, but actually dangerous unless they spring spontaneously from a real altruistic impulse inherent in ourselves.* And by this striving after doing, we have ceased to remember the fundamental need to know ourselves in order that we may *be* ourselves; so we have more and more silted up the channels that connect us with the central Life of the universe. The vitality of the Western world has been lowered for this very simple reason; our roots have been atrophied by this surface living; not understanding that in our separate superficial selves there is no vital life-spring, we have ceased to draw, deep down, life from that which is Life. We act, without being; but action is of no value except it spring spontaneous; it must act because it is the natural expression of living being, discovered by profound contemplation; not as the manufactured expression of superficial intellectualism.

We need to approach Lenin with all this in our minds; for it is his attack on established institutions that has chiefly caused him to be execrated: on religion, marriage, the family, rights of ownership. Why did he attack them? He attacked religion, not in its essence as that by which man draws his life from the whole; but in our modern travesty of it: that which falsifies reality by idealising; shelters men from their fears, instead of resolving them; cloaks hypocrisy; a thing of ceremonial whose symbols have supplanted the realities they only showed forth. Can any man who faces facts deny that Western Christianity is the contradiction and enemy of what its founder

Jesus preached? He who had not where to lay his head, whose kingdom was not of this world, sees his church become the proud possessor of material riches and temporal power. In Russia this superficiality reached its climax; no religion that had a living core could have crashed as promptly and easily as did the Orthodox church before the revolutionary attack; persecution has never yet killed a live religion. Marriage; the family: both have been becoming more and more institutions to destroy mutual life rather than to stimulate it; parasitism, not partnership. Rights of ownership: do not these lie at the very root of the materialism which we know to be the mortal canker of the modern world? At all these institutions Lenin struck; not in their ultimate essences, but in their dead counterfeits; deadeners, for that reason, of living things. He saw the necessity of cutting away the stifling tangle of dead wood, in order that the struggling shoots of new might grow.

He was a realist; but his realism must not be confounded with the materialism of machine-made civilisation, though he appreciated fully the value of machines. It is a fatal mistake to regard the endeavour of Russia after material prosperity as an end in itself. His ultimate object was the attainment of communism; not in Russia alone, or even particularly; but internationally. As a revolutionary general he found himself compelled to concentrate on Russia because only there was the first foothold to be gained, for a reason foreseen by him all along; revolution for a communistic ideal is likely to succeed first not where the proletariat is strongest, but where capitalism is weakest. The attempt to strengthen Russia's economic position—the economic position of the first communistic state—is part of that campaign, but never its final aim and object; its purpose is to form a nucleus, from which to work outwards. As Lenin wrote in *The Great Initiative*:

> It is just as natural as it is necessary that in the period immediately after the revolution, the workers' and peasants' government should devote all its strength to the task of crushing bourgeois opposition and suppressing counter-revolutionary plots. To this is added another task, just as unavoidable and necessary; one which becomes more evident as time goes on: the positive task of real communistic constructive work, the creation of a new economic system of a new society.
>
> The dictatorship of the proletariat is not simply a force to be used against the exploiting class, though it must express itself in terms of force. The proletariat has realised a higher form of the social organization of labour. That is the guarantee for the continuation and success of the revolutionary government; and to secure this continuation and success, the dictatorship of the proletariat must be consolidated in the economic sphere.

(It must not be imagined that Lenin was under any delusion with regard to the proletariat; he knew that it had to be educated, and raised from the condition to which the capitalistic form of society had sunk it, not only economically and intellectually, but in more vital directions. But

he was also determined that it should be educated in the right way—not "talked down to," but trained to "think up" to its real capacity. And it is to such an educated proletariat that he is referring in these passages.)

His object, then, in working towards consolidation in the economic sphere was not at all the creation of a material paradise for the worker, as some have imagined. Why should it be, seeing that he was a man as little luxurious in his personal life and desires as Jesus himself? He worked for consolidation in that sphere, because he knew that on economic security rests the base of freedom, for men as for nations; and that only by stably fixing that base can ever be attained the desired cessation of the exploitation of man by man, that communist state in which shall be realised the law "to everyone according to his needs, from everyone according to his ability".

It is of vital importance that the truth about Lenin, and his aims, should not be lost sight of; for thoughtful people are beginning to realise more and more that in the fulfilment of those aims, in their essential, not in any superficial significance, lies probably the true and only counterblast to that deadly concentration on material prosperity and external comfort and security, which is sapping the very life of men and nations in the world to-day.

M. ROBINSON

In the present state of society, especially in so-called civilized countries, we are continually brought face to face with the fact that large numbers of people are suffering from misery, poverty and disease. Their physical condition is wretched, and their mental and spiritual faculties are often almost dormant. On the other hand, many persons at the opposite end of the social scale are leading lives of careless indifference, material luxury, and selfish indulgence. Neither of these forms of existence is mere chance. Both are the effects of the conditions which surround those who are subject to them, and the neglect of social duty on the one side is most closely connected with the stunted and arrested development on the other. In sociology, as in all branches of true science, the law of universal causation holds good. But this causation necessarily implies, as its logical outcome, that human solidarity on which Theosophy so strongly insists. If the action of one reacts on the lives of all, and this is the true scientific idea, then it is only by all men becoming brothers and all women sisters, and by all practising in their daily lives true brotherhood and true sisterhood, that the real human solidarity, which lies at the root of the elevation of the race, can ever be attained.

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Key to Theosophy*, (Indian Ed.) pp. 196–97.

PHYSICS, PHILOSOPHY, AND THEOSOPHY

[**Philip Chapin Jones** is a scientific researcher and student whose sincere interest in Theosophical philosophy extends over a long period of years. In his article an excellent survey of the progress of physics towards Theosophy is made and a serious philosophical interpretation is attempted with marked ability.—EDS.]

In 1891, the year of H. P. Blavatsky's death, physical science was progressing with assured self-complacency. For the past two-hundred years discovery had been rapidly following discovery, and so encouraged was physics that it had tacitly undertaken to explain—partially at once, and completely after some further years of experimentation—the mysteries of nature which had until then baffled the efforts of millenniums of philosophers and sages: Obviously, so it seemed to the physicists, the highest source of information was nature herself, and the tools to be employed were experiment and mathematics. Superficially their position seemed sound, and the world waited expectant for the culminating and perfecting discoveries.

With this entire body of thought H. P. B. took issue. For a dozen years she had been pointing out fundamental weaknesses and indicating logical inconsistencies. In 1888, writing in *The Secret Doctrine*, she finally predicted the overthrow of the entire body of physical science—a prediction seeming so impossible of realization that few men gave it notice—"between this time [1888] and 1897 there will be a large rent made in the Veil of Nature, and materialistic science will receive a death-blow."* Thus she wrote, and within a year the few drops that presage the monsoon, in the persons of Michelson and Morley, had splashed the heretofore unruffled surface of scientific complacency.

As H. P. B. had predicted, the monsoon struck between 1895 and 1897 with the discovery of radio-activity by the Curies in France and the isolation of the electron by J. J. Thomson. It has been blowing—with increased violence during the last decade—almost ever since. The decennium from 1896 to 1905 was referred to by Sir James Hopwood Jeans, only a few months ago† before a group of scientific societies in New York, as those "ten wonderful years" which "took away the material basis on which we had worked so long". No longer could the universe be thought of, again quoting the same address, "as a great, elaborate piece of machinery crushing by its weight, but rather as a universe of thought". In other words the concrete, material universe of 1888 has, within the last generation, become such stuff as dreams are made of.

* *Secret Doctrine*, Vol. 1, p. 612.
† May 28, 1931. Printed in the *Scientific Monthly*, July 1931.

In the view of the science of 1888 the world consisted of matter and energy, or matter and force since force is the physical indication of energy. Under the action of force matter is moved through space so that the concept of motion or velocity entered; and time, of course, is a component of every phenomenon. In addition to an array of mechanical forces, such as the muscular forces of man and animals, and the forces due to matter in motion, there were three distinct and basic types of forces of a more immaterial nature: electrostatic, magnetic, and gravitational. The laws of action of these forces were well known, and since it was these laws that were mostly relied upon for the explanation of the universe, existing ignorance of the nature of the forces was glossed over and forgotten.

In the realm of matter lay science's greatest discoveries. The material universe was known to be composed of some four score elemental substances—92 possible elements are recognized at the present time. To our senses all substance appears to be continuous: uniform material with no interstices within its surface. Science had found, however, that matter was really atomic—composed of a large number of very small particles called molecules. So closely are the molecules crowded together, judged from normal standards of distance, that material substances appear continuous although actually the distance between molecules is very large compared to their diameter.

The molecules composing the entire range of matter are built up of some grouping or combination of atoms of one or more of the elemental substances that science had discovered. The nature and characteristics of all these elements were very well known. The atom itself was indivisible and by its permanency formed a suitable basic unit for a mechanistic and material scheme of things.

The goal of science at the beginning of the mauve decade was to explain every known phenomenon of the universe in terms of a permanent substratum of matter—atomic in structure—and of known forces. So much had already been explained on this basis, so many difficulties had disappeared before persistent attack, that the objective seemed not only possible but just around the corner.

Underlying all the scientific theories of that time was an absolute and realistic attitude. An ether, a sort of primal substance of enormously high tenuity and with almost unbelievable characteristics, was supposed to pervade space, and in it, in definitely calculable positions at any time, moved the earth and all celestial objects. The ether served to transmit certain forces and forms of energy, such as gravity and light, and formed a fixed set of axes to which all motion could be referred. This ether penetrated all matter: the atoms and molecules moved in it, bound together by intermolecular and atomic

forces to form material objects. Each atom and molecule was a real object with a definite position at any instant. They were like extremely minute billiard balls moving about among each other, occasionally colliding, but always held together by their gravitational forces into a definite external form.

Such was the view of science of 1890. The conceptions of the present time—some forty years later—are as different in their fundamental philosophic concepts as can well be imagined. The discovery of the electron, the quantum theory, relativity, and the more recent wave mechanics have created a new universe, or to speak more accurately have completely subverted the old, because the new universe does not seem to be so fundamentally a universe. It does not hang together with the consistency of the old—it does not at times even seem to make sense.

Although the complete exposition of the theories of modern physics requires an appalling amount of advanced mathematics, the major features of the present conceptions are easily comprehensible. Outstanding is the complete overthrow of materialism in its form of the ninth decade of the nineteenth century. At that time, matter—concrete, tangible, definite, and thought to be indisputably substance—was the basis of the universe. Now, matter as a fundamental substance is non-existent.

The atom of 1888, the minute billiard ball of matter, first became a solar system of electricity: a nucleus of positive electricity corresponding to the sun, and electrons, small spheres of negative electricity, revolving around it as planets. Thus one of the most paradoxical statements of *The Secret Doctrine*, that matter was electricity, became recognized by science. With this step matter became more abstract, less material. Electricity, although capable of exerting forces of undoubted tangibility was still not matter in the usual sense of the term. To conceive matter as made of electricity was certainly to feel it to be something far more ethereal, far less material, than it had formerly been thought to be.

The decrease in the materiality of matter has gone farther than this, however. An electron, although thought of as electrical in its nature, was still felt to retain many aspects of materiality. Its nature was too uncertain to be described, but it was, presumably, a sphere of something or other which could at least be called substance. Similar conceptions were held of the proton or positive unit of electricity forming the nucleus or central sun of the atoms. Modern wave mechanics, however, converts both electrons and protons—and thus all material bodies—into nothing but groups of waves, and when a more concretely or materially minded person asks: Waves in or of what? he is nonplussed to learn that they are waves in or of—nothing at all. The definition of a wave is merely a mathematical expression. All

that is known is that when the mathematical expressions for the waves of electrons and protons are combined in certain manners and passed through certain mathematical processes of assumed validity, they become expressions which correctly define verifiable physical phenomena. To such straits has the material universe been reduced as a result of the discoveries of the last forty years of physics.

Along with this thorough-going revamping of physical concepts—paralleling and assisting it in some places, opposing in others—has marched the theory of relativity. Pre-relativity thought pictured a universe of events occurring according to definite laws, and independent of ourselves. The conception was of a real and independent universe, in which we moved, lived, and observed events that were entirely independent of our own existence or state. Relativity entirely does away with this. Events are not absolute, but relative, to ourselves. I may observe an event, determine its characteristics precisely by methods, authenticity of which is beyond doubt. You may observe the same event and make equally precise measurements of it, and yet our measurements may not check each other.

This relativity of which we are now talking applies to certain physical laws only, and the discrepancies between the two sets of measurements mentioned arise because we are in motion relative to each other—perhaps I on the ground and you in an airplane—although for the differences to be appreciable, the relative difference in velocity must be very great. Because it is only for very large differences in velocity that its effects become noticeable, relativity plays but a small part in our lives. Regardless of the magnitude of its effects, however, it completely overthrows the conception of an absolute universe.

Relativity stresses aspects. What we see of the universe is one aspect, and the particular aspect w observe depends on factors applying to ourselves alone. To one familiar with *The Secret Doctrine* it is not necessary to point out how closely this conception harmonizes with the writings of H. P. B. Quotations could be arranged endlessly, but two may serve as representatives: "Spirit and Matter are, however, to be regarded not as independent realities, but as the two facets or aspects of the Absolute...."* "On the other hand, precosmic root-substance (*Mulaprakriti*) is that *aspect* (Italics are mine, here) of the Absolute which underlies all objective planes of Nature."† That science would begin to approach the point of view of the Secret Doctrine in this century is not surprising to students of theosophy for H.P.B. wrote in 1888: "For in the twentieth century of our era scholars will begin to recognize that the *Secret Doctrine* has neither been invented nor exaggerated..."‡

To scientists nothing but a

* *Secret Doctrine*, Proem, p. 15
† *Secret Doctrine* Proem, p. 15
‡ *Secret Doctrine* Introd. p. xxxvii

scientific demonstration of theosophy would be convincing, and although it will probably come it still lies in the future. To those more philosophically minded, however, evidences of the fundamental truths of *The Secret Doctrine*, although unbelievably neglected, have long been available, and the time of their publication is a matter of considerable interest to those acquainted with the hundred year cycles so frequently referred to by H. P. B.

Newton, in 1687, laid down a set of postulates upon which it seemed possible to construct a material universe conforming to the observed facts of nature. Guided by these, scientists and mathematicians laboured for two-hundred years: verifying assumptions, accumulating new facts, and rounding out the basic theory. Complete verification and proof seemed imminent. Then, in 1888, almost exactly two centuries after Newton, H.P.B. published her *Secret Doctrine*. Her colossal array of facts she brought not from recent experiment, not from new theories, but from knowledge inconceivably old. She pointed out the weaknesses and fallacies underlying the conceptions of a material universe and predicted that from science itself would arise the evidence of its falsity.

Almost exactly between these two events—in 1781—had been published another book which sheds a very significant light on both the Secret Doctrine and modern science. That work was the ***Critique of Pure Reason*** by Immanuel Kant. Without the epistemological conceptions of the *Critique*, both the Secret Doctrine and the position of modern science are more or less meaningless as viewed from the ordinary material standpoint. With it, the harmony and the relationship of the two, and of both to our ordinary life and development, become clear.

For Kant shows by purely rational processes that the material universe, as we perceive it, is not something existing by itself and independent of ourselves but merely an aspect of something which we cannot comprehend in our present state of consciousness. All our knowledge, all cognition from the recognition of a simple scent or sound to a complex philosophical conception, depends on our intellectual mechanism. It is all coloured and shaped by the pigments and tools of our sensuous and intellectual processes. I do not refer to prejudices, disposition, or such accidental characteristics, but to the fundamental structure of our knowledge-producing machinery. Our knowledge is not absolute, but relative to ourselves; it is a partial translation into our imperfect material language of an unknown cosmological treatise. The true nature of everything is inverted and essentially altered by the imperfect lens of our present state of consciousness.

What the real nature of the world is cannot be known because the stimuli that come from without pass through the mechanism of our consciousness: are tinted—to feebly attempt a picture—by the coloured glass of our spectacles of perception. Plato's classic example of the observation of shadows is but another suggestive interpretation of the actual state of things.

Our machinery for knowing is dual in its nature: one part, the sensuous, receives impressions—sight, hearing, touch, taste, and smell; the other, intellectual, combines and analyses the various primary sensations, and by arranging them under concepts gives us knowledge. Each of these two tools of knowledge, the sensory and the intellectual, have a definite structure and procedure, which determine our plane of consciousness. For most of the world the structure and procedure are alike. As to the exceptions, and the reason for them, philosophy tells us nothing, but theosophy does.

The structure of our sensory apparatus is referred to in ordinary language as space and time. Space is not something real, not something existing by itself, but merely the form of our external sensory perception. Time, similarly, is merely the form of our internal sensory perception. Everything that can come before our senses has to conform to the requirements of space and time. They are the tinted glasses, the imperfect lens, through which we see the real world.

Thus Kant taught in 1781, thus he satisfactorily proved. His demonstrations were abstruse, however, difficult to follow, and have never been widely understood. To the student of theosophy, however, his teachings are of immense value because they so completely verify—from a strictly philosophical and human-plane-of-consciousness point of view—the teachings of the Secret Doctrine. Being complementary, theosophy and philosophy clarify each other.

Since time is merely a form of our sensory perception, it is not an attribute of things by themselves. To a being, therefore, functioning on some other plane of consciousness, time is non-existent, and it is no more difficult to perceive an event in what is to us the future, than in the past or present. This conception of time thus serves to explain many phenomena which without it seem miraculous—and the Secret Doctrine teaches that there are no miracles.

The conception of space as merely the form of our external sense perception, likewise explains, or rather makes comprehensible, many other phenomena such as apportation, which science—because it had no explanation available—has refused to recognize.

Philosophy, in the work of Kant, thus corrorborates theosophy: it gives reasons suitable to our present plane of consciousness to show the possibility, even probability in some instances—and more than this cannot be expected in our present state of consciousness—of the entire structure of theosophy. It also harmonizes modern science with reason, an accomplishment of great apparent difficulty. The relativity theory is only a specific application of the general conceptions underlying Kant's *Critique*. Both Kant

and relativity, without placing any limit on what we may know of things in their relations to ourselves, are alike in positively stating that we can know nothing of the doings of an absolute world.

Wave mechanics also, although not yet completely reconciled to relativity, is justified and understandable on the basis of Kant. In wave mechanics all material particles, all matter of any kind, is viewed as a group of waves extending throughout space but not everywhere of the same amplitude. Over a small volume they will be of large amplitude and this will be the region said to be occupied, in the ordinary sense of the word, by the material. At the borders of this region they rapidly decrease in intensity but in an attenuated form extend to infinity.

Philosophy, of course, can never verify physics in the matter of details; its function is to lay down a certain foundation which within reasonable limits defines the shape and size of the structure that may be erected upon it. An agreement between philosophy and physics, therefore, can go no further than saying that such and such a physical edifice does fit the philosophical foundation laid for it. Philosophy is like a many valued function in mathematics: it may have any of several solutions. Although no one specific solution can be asserted to be the correct one on a philosophical basis, any solutions that are possible will have certain characteristics in common which can be known beforehand. Wave mechanics does fit, with an almost unbelievable nicety, the philosophical basis of Kant. Although it cannot be said, therefore, that it is the correct physical solution of philosophy, it is a possible one. Since relativity is also a solution of another aspect of physics, it should harmonize with wave mechanics, and it is more than likely, therefore, that the next few years will see the solution of the present discrepancies.

Of even greater importance than this harmony, however, is that theosophy—and by that word I mean the ancient Secret Doctrine as partially disclosed by H. P. B. during the latter quarter of the last century—fits in with, explains, and complements both Kant's philosophy and modern physics-science. True philosophy and true science are but aspects, on our present plane of consciousness, of the truer and deeper knowledge that underlies the Secret Doctrine: the true synthesis of science, religion, and philosophy.

PHILIP CHAPIN JONES

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

MAGIC AND OCCULTISM

[**Dr. C. J. S. Thompson, M. B. E.,** is a recognized expounder of certain aspects of more than one Occult art. He is a fellow of the Royal Society of Medicine, Associate of the Royal Academy of Medicine (Turin) and the Hon. Curator of the historical section of the museum of Royal College of Surgeons. Among his numerous publications are *Mysteries and Secrets of Magic*, *Mysteries of History*, and *The Mystery and Art of the Apothecary*. In the following article, written because of the Centenary Anniversary Edition of *Isis Unveiled*, by H. P. Blavatsky, we have the view of a writer who, though a scientist, is deeply versed in the theories of magic and mysticism.

One of the missions of H. P. B. was to raise Magic from the degrading superstition into which it had fallen to its proper place as the science by which control over nature's forces may be acquired and beneficently used.

That there are latent powers in men, which can be developed, is a fact more recognized to-day than in 1877 when *Isis Unveiled* was published. That there is a dual set of lower psychic and higher spiritual powers is another fact which she taught and which also is gaining acceptance. Mr. J. Middleton Murry's review (January) dealt with one phase of Theosophical philosophy presented in *Isis Unveiled*; below is printed another.—EDS.]

The extensive field covered by this remarkable work is all the more astonishing when we recall that the author, when she began the stupendous task in 1874, had but a slight colloquial acquaintance with the English language and had hardly lived a year in America. No one who studies *Isis Unveiled* can fail to be impressed by the profound erudition and versatility displayed by the author who set out on the great task of reviewing the realms of science and theology from their genesis, down to the close of the nineteenth century. To give a clear insight into the chief objects of her work, Madame Blavatsky explains that she wrote it to prove that underlying every ancient popular religion, was the same ancient wisdom-doctrine, one and identical, professed and practised by initiates of every country who alone were aware of its existence and importance. To ascertain its origin and the precise age in which it was matured, she was aware, was now beyond human possibility. A philosophy so profound, a moral code so ennobling, and practical results so conclusive and so uniformly demonstrable, is not the growth of a generation or even a single epoch.

In dealing with the occult sciences, she realized the importance of their study and her observations on the various branches of occultism will well repay close attention.

Mme. Blavatsky was not content to draw her conclusions from the observations of earlier investigators but she travelled in the far East in order to study from personal experience the history and

practice of the occult arts in the Orient.

After amassing a vast amount of information, which she says she gathered from the Sages of the East, she expresses her deep regret that she had to leave "India with its blue sky and mysterious past, religious devotees and its weird sorcerers".

As the result of her labours she came to the conclusion that belief in magic was universal, and that this accounts for the extraordinary identity of superstitions, customs, traditions and even sentences repeated in popular proverbs, so widely scattered among the peoples of the earth from one pole to the other. Thus we find exactly the same ideas among the Tartars and Laplanders as among the Southern nations of Europe, from the inhabitants of the steppes of Russia to the aborigines of North and South America.

All those who have studied the origins of magic will agree with the fact that the same ideas were common among races lying far apart, and that the similarity of the practices in connexion with the performance of magical rites, in widely different parts of the world, is remarkable.

Research among the ancient records of the Babylonians and Assyrians reveals that the figure of clay or wax that was stuck with nails or thorns, or allowed to melt away before a fire, in order to work ill on an enemy, was employed in magical rites and witchcraft over three thousand years ago, and that belief in the "evil eye" was as common among the early Babylonians, as it is among the races of Southern Europe today.

Mme. Blavatsky relates a curious personal experience of the remarkable results produced by the Eastern "Wise Men," by the simple act of breathing upon a person whether with good or evil intent. If such a person happens to be standing facing a certain wind it is thought there is always danger. She once met an old Persian from Baku on the Caspian, who claimed to be able to throw spells on people through help of this wind. "If a victim," she says "against whom the wrath of the old fiend was kindled, happened to be facing this wind, he would . . . cross the road and breathe in his face. From that moment, the latter would find himself afflicted with every evil. He was under the spell of the 'evil eye'."

This power she attributes to mesmerism, for mesmerism, she tells us, she regarded as the most important branch of magic, and its phenomena, she believed, were the effects of the universal agent which underlies all magic. "Mesmerism," she asserts "may most readily be turned into the worst of sorceries."

Among the Hindus, less is known of the general practice of magic than among other ancient peoples. With them it was more esoteric if possible than among the priesthood of ancient Egypt. It was deemed so sacred that even its existence was only half admitted, and it was more a religious

matter, for it was regarded as Divine.

The Egyptian hierophants could not be compared with the ascetical Gymnosophists of India who denied themselves the simplest comforts of life, and dwelt in woods and led the lives of secluded hermits. It is impossible to say whether these Gymnosophists were the real founders of magic in India, or whether they only practised what had been passed to them as an inheritance from the earliest Rishis—the Sages antedating the Vedic period.

Magic plays an important part in the *Atharvaveda*, and asceticism, fasting, abstinence and silence were practised as they were believed to confer power.

In her survey of magical practices prevailing among various early peoples in different parts of the world, Mme. Blavatsky concludes that the same fundamental principle underlies their beliefs in the occult. Belief in astrology, which is regarded as the oldest of the occult sciences, has been common in India from a remote period.

Its foundations were based on the theory that from the heavenly bodies are derived air and ether, from them fire, from these three water, and from the combination of the four, earth.

Since these elements were supposed to come from the heavenly bodies, it followed that living things on the earth should be influenced by the "flowing forth" of some ethereal emanation from the planets. Mme. Blavatsky held the view that astrology was a science as infallible as astronomy itself, with the condition, however, that its interpreters must be equally infallible. She aptly compares the relation of astrology to astronomy to that of psychology to exact physiology, and of alchemy to chemistry.

The action of the heavenly bodies on plants and vegetation was but imperfectly understood untill 1643, when Kircher pointed out that "the sun's emanations were binding all things to itself, and that it imparts this binding power to everything falling under its direct rays."

With respect to alchemy, Mme. Blavatsky was of the opinion that its practice was more universal than was generally supposed, and that it was always auxiliary or accompanied by the study of the kindred occult sciences as magic, necromancy and astrology, but this was not always so. She suggests that these sciences were originally but forms of a spiritism which was generally extant in all ages of human history. We know that in Egypt and among the other early civilizations, the priest was the practitioner of both magic and astrology, and that this association of the sciences continued down to the Middle Ages, when the study of alchemy was often combined with astrology. In the sixteenth century in Europe, the practice of alchemy and magic was more common among priests and monks than perhaps among any other class. Mme. Blavatsky was gifted by that

faculty given to some women which may be called "vision". She recognised the value of the study of history in all branches of science. She was convinced, and we believe rightly, that from time immemorial, the far East was the cradle of knowledge, not only of occult sciences, but also of the healing art, for which minerals and plants were studied extensively in India from a very early period.

She shows in *Isis Unveiled* that the more we know of the past the more we realise how much is to be learnt from it, and how little we have changed, save in fashions and labels. Every student is surprised to find how very little is the share of new truth which even the greatest genius has added to the previous stock.

With characteristic foresight, Mme. Blavatsky recognised the genius of Paracelsus whose work, fifty years ago, was only just beginning to be appreciated. For centuries after his death he was regarded as little more than a charlatan and quack, but a clearer understanding of his works has shown him to have been a pioneer in science of a high order, whose discoveries opened up many fields of research. She found, from a study of his works, that electro-magnetism was known to him three hundred years before it was rediscovered by Oersted, and that the doctrines of Mesmer were simply a re-statement of his doctrines, which had been developed by Van Helmont his disciple. She mentions the fact, that so firm was the popular belief in the supernormal powers of Paracelsus, that to this day the tradition survives among the simple-minded peasants of the district where he spent his last days, that he is not dead but sleepeth in his grave at Salzburg where he lies. They often whisper among themselves that deep groans are heard as the great physician, philosopher and healer, awakes to the remembrance of the cruel wrongs he suffered at the hands of his slanderers for the sake of the great truth. The sick and maimed still pay pilgrimages to his tomb on the anniversary of his death in the hope that by so doing they may obtain relief from their sufferings.

In the East only, Mme. Blavatsky asserts, will the student of psychology find abundant food for his truth-hungering soul. Climate, as well as the occult influences daily felt, not only modify the physio-psychological nature of man, but even alter the constitution of the so-called organic and inorganic matter, in a degree not fairly realised by European science.

It is well known that the action and effects of certain drugs, such as Indian hemp, differs to a considerable extent when given in India and when administered in Europe.

Wendell Phillips points out that besides the psychological nature of man being affected by change of climate, the people of the East have physical senses far more acute than Europeans. He mentions the fact that in Kashmir, the eyes of the girls who weave shawls are able to see colours which to the European do not exist.

In many branches of science today, in spite of the great advance that has been made within the past fifty years, we are still groping after the truth and still hoping to stumble on the keys that will unlock the doors which will disclose many mysteries which were probably clear to those who lived thousands of years ago, but which have since been lost in the eons of time.

A great work still remains for some learned and erudite student of occultism in India, to examine and explore the innumerable early manuscripts still preserved in many parts of that great Empire, with a view to throwing more light on many occult mysteries of the East.

Isis Unveiled clearly shows that Mme. Blavatsky believed that the study of the occult sciences was one of importance and should be carried out in the East.

Like others, since her time, she was a seeker after truth. Though many may not agree with her doctrines and the conclusions she arrived at and crystallised in *Isis Unveiled*, yet all who study that work must recognise how deeply she explored the knowledge of the past and with what clear-sightedness she appraised its value to the present.

Concerning the occult sciences, on which we have been able to comment but briefly, the information and instruction to be gathered from this volume will be found to be of the greatest value to all who are interested in the subject.

C. J. S. THOMPSON

A CHINESE BOOK OF LIFE AND A PSYCHOLOGIST'S READING OF IT*

[**Hugh I'A. Fausset** writes a vigorous but judicious criticism of a psychoanalyst's mentality, and presents a thought-provoking review in the following article.—EDS.]

It is possible that Richard Wilhelm, despite the years of sensitive study which he devoted to Chinese literature, attached undue importance to the Taoist text which he translated with a commentary and of which we are here given an excellent English rendering in a book that is beautifully produced in every detail. Yet although he might well have been able to choose a more significant text from the Taoist Canon, if more of it had been available at the time when he wrote, the present text, although somewhat

* *The Secret of the Golden Flower.* Translated and explained by Richard Wilhelm. With a European Commentary by C. G. Jung. With eleven Plates and four Text Illustrations (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co. Ltd. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

fragmentary and probably late, is sufficiently interesting and profound to justify the labour which he expended upon it. For a Westerner ignorant of occult practice it may seem at times obscure and baffling, despite Wilhelm's introductory explanations and the recent native commentary which follows each section of the text and aims at clarifying its meaning. Yet although many of its deeper implications will hardly be understood by any but advanced initiates, anyone who is spiritually sensitive cannot fail to derive benefit from a study of the system of self-discipline and liberation which it embodies. There is nothing perverse in the exercises which it outlines. They are in fact outwardly very simple, but to be rightly and fruitfully performed they demand a selfless concentration of which few perhaps in the West are at present capable. Yet even if few of us are sufficiently advanced to make beneficial use of the practical method of meditation which it defines, there must be many who will profit by the spiritual insight, which underlies and overrules the method. The West has been for the last three hundred years at least overwhelmingly extrovert. Its energy has streamed outward in mental and physical action. But because this energy has lacked a true creative centre and has been dictated in different degrees by a divided will, it has generated waste and discord. What we need, therefore, above all as Westerners is to discover a true centre for our action and our thought. And we can only discover it in ourselves. We need to withdraw, to turn the current of our lives inward, not in a spirit of passive indifference to the practical and progressive demands of life, but in order that our actions may spring from an established inner centre, that they may express that Creative Will within us which is more than a personal will.

The aim of all pure methods of Yoga has been to train men to live from such a centre, to be at once attentive, enlightened, and at ease (not tense through nervous and egotistic effort), to remain at peace even while obeying the demands of action. And in this book the ancient wisdom of non-action in action is once more enunciated, the secret of becoming receptive to the eternal light, of building up a new being in the heart of which the Golden Flower may shine, so that the Spirit is no longer at the mercy of outward forms and transient distractions, but both possesses itself and enters into the external world in perfect freedom.

But this book has a particular interest for both Eastern and Western readers because Dr. Jung contributes a long commentary on the text in which he draws upon his experience as a psychoanalyst and criticises mysticism and occultism from a psychological standpoint. As a psychoanalyst Jung is certainly more profound than either Freud or Adler. Probably no living psychologist is more competent to criticise such a text as this. The

fundamental inadequacy and even perverseness of some of his criticism is, therefore, a just measure of the inadequacy of the scientific mind, even at its best and most human, to appreciate the deeper realities of the Spirit. Doubtless he is right in deploring certain Western imitations of the East. An enlightened Easterner would equally deplore certain Eastern imitations of the West. But it is possible for the West and the East to learn from each other without being false to their own being and their own traditional culture. For the mastery of the inner world in which the East has excelled cannot without disaster be divorced from mastery of the outer world in which the West has excelled. The two are complementary and interdependent, but the former, since it is the necessary precondition of all true action, must take precedence over the latter. And it is this which Jung fails to recognise when he describes Science as "the one safe foundation of the Western mind". He may be right when he claims elsewhere that Science is "the best tool of the Western mind," but as a foundation it is obviously inadequate since it is itself a partial expression of the mind which he suggests it should support. Western Science, in short, can only prove a beneficent instrument in spiritual hands and it cannot spiritualise the hands that use it. The spiritual teaching of the East is valuable to us, not because it persuades us to abandon our scientific tool, but because it can help us to use that tool creatively by re-creating our beings. To Jung the teaching contained in this text is infinitely remote from our needs. "We should do well to confess," he writes, "that, fundamentally speaking, we do not understand the utter unworldliness of a text like this, indeed, that we do not want to understand it." The confession is revealing and explains many of the defects of his later psychological interpretation. For if this text is unworldly, then all the great religious teachers who have insisted that we can only be truly and effectively at home in the world, if our essential home is in eternity and only there, have been guilty of utter unworldliness too and by implication unintelligible. Certainly hosts of men and women have not wanted to understand them with the results that are everywhere apparent. Jung, as a physician as well as an informed observer of his age, is well aware that our Western culture "sickens with a thousand ills," but he insists that the task of building it up again must be done by "the real European as he is in his Western commonplaceness, with his neuroses, and his whole philosophical disorientation".

In so far as he means that the Westerner must work out his own salvation, he is perfectly right. But in suggesting that the modern Western psychologist is a better guide to salvation than the Eastern or indeed any mystic and that there is no such thing as metaphysical experience, he is denying the light which alone can liberate.

If his aim were merely to discredit speculative metaphysics, the mystic would applaud it. But when he writes that "to understand metaphysically is impossible; it can only be done psychologically," he is repudiating the higher powers of understanding because he does not possess them himself.

The truly metaphysical is both psychically and spiritually experienced. Its reality is received and known, not by the critical mind working in detachment from life and the other faculties, but by the whole being, by those whose divided faculties have become unified and harmonised in an enlightened consciousness. Such reality cannot be analysed by a psychologist who is mentally outside it. But it is no less real. And to deny, as Jung does, the reality or intelligibility of all experience which an analyst cannot measure, is merely to betray a perverse intellectual pride. And it is equally pride when it assumes the tones of humility, as when he writes, "Every statement about the transcendental ought to be avoided because it is invariably a laughable presumption on the part of the human mind, unconscious of its limitations."

In fact those who affirm the reality of the transcendental recognise far more deeply the mind's limitations than those who deny it. For they know that the human mind is impotent in itself to apprehend spiritual truth, and that only when the veil of the knowing, self-conscious self is lifted, is reality given to us.

In Jung's identification of the "Christos" with "the unconscious" and his apparent failure to measure the gulf in spiritual consciousness which lies between the biologically inspired Mandālas made by some of his neurotic patients, which he reproduces, and the Lamaist Mandāla which appears as a frontispiece, we have typical examples of the limitations of a merely mental and psychological understanding. Yet in many ways Jung is surprisingly sympathetic towards Eastern ideas, so long as they remain Eastern. And his essay should certainly be read. For it at least reveals some very striking parallels between modern Western efforts to achieve reunion with the laws of life represented in the unconscious by merely physical and mental adjustments and that deeper science of being which insists that such reunion can only be won through spiritual rebirth and the evolution of a higher consciousness.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

GOD AND HIS SHADOW*

[**J. D. Beresford's** review of three recent volumes makes a synthetical and very Theosophical exposition.—EDS.]

The religious sense in humanity, a sense that persists and increases to the stultification of every possible account offered by a mechanistic philosophy, is curiously illustrated in three comparatively recent books, all of which should be of interest, if only as a commentary, to readers of THE ARYAN PATH.

The first of these is a historical record that takes us back to the Middle Ages. It is called *Witchcraft, Magic and Alchemy*, and is translated from the French of M. Grillot de Givry by J. Courtenay Locke. The substance of this work is a collection and reproduction of the iconography of mediæval occultism, taken from such sources as carvings in stone from sacred buildings, contemporary wood-cuts, and paintings by artists of repute, mainly Dutch, German and French. To these reproductions are added by way of text, a commentary that is largely expository but contains, now and again, a hint of criticism. It is not, however, M. de Givry's object to relate the superstitions and beliefs, here so copiously illustrated, to modern experience nor to examine their relation to the real truths of occultism.

The outstanding record that will most deeply impress the modern reader of M. de Givry's work is the enormous importance given in Western Europe at that time to the personal Devil with his host of demon attendants. Evil as a positive force had been elevated to such a pitch that it had become necessary to present it in the form of a being whose powers were only less than that of God. Satan primarily figures as the archtempter, but this elevation of him inevitably resulted in his adoration as a representative of enormous potency; and when we come to a close examination of the thought of the time we see the teachings of the Christian Church being computed by their own invention of this new god.

For there can be no question that Satan in those times found an abundance of worshippers. The witches' Sabbath with its unholy rites, its deliberate and powerful attempt to exalt the forces of Evil, was something more than a parable. We may not believe that the witches so abundantly figured in the work before us, were in fact able to fly up the chimney on a broomstick nor to suffer strange metamorphoses into animal and demoniac shapes. But we cannot doubt that there were secret

---

* *Witchcraft, Magic and Alchemy*, translated from the French of Grillot de Givry, by J. Courtenay Locke. (George G. Harrap and Company Ltd., London. 42*s*.)

The Zermatt Dialogues, by Douglas Fawcett. (Macmillan and Co., Ltd. London.)

The Interpretation of Religious Experience, by Dr. Percy Gardner. (Williams and Norgate Ltd., London. 6*s*.)

ceremonies, in which the attempted and sometimes successful practice of Black Magic was the chief if not the only object.

We might well pass such stories by now with a smile at some of the naïvetés and credulities of the uncultured mediæval mind if it were not that an aspect of this old exaltation of Satan into a wonder-worker going up and down the earth seeking victims, were not still an article of belief at the present day. The error of thought arises obviously from the early attempt of the theologians to present evil as a positive instead of a negative element in the universe, and there are few priests in the modern Churches who would accept the clear, logical and completely convincing account of evil set out in *The Secret Doctrine.** The whole chapter should be read carefully in this connection, but the essence of it lies in the plain and incontrovertible statement: "There is no *malum in se*: only the shadow of light, without which light could have no existence, even in our perceptions. If evil disappeared good would disappear along with it from Earth." (I. 413)

Our second book is of a very different order. It is by Douglas Fawcett,—who has already published two powerful and scholarly philosophical works touched by an originality of thought and imagination that definitely lifted them out of the plane of the purely academic,—and is entitled *The Zermatt Dialogues*, with the explanatory sub-title "Constituting the outlines of a philosophy of Mysticism, mainly on problems of cosmic import". The participants in the discussion are a mystic, an Oxford don, a professor of physics, a pagan poet, and an explorer who is also a fascist M. P., but we realise throughout that it is Mr. Fawcett who is conducting this small orchestra, and has written their parts for them; and that the motive may always be found in the score allotted to the mystic.

To one who has studied the works of Madame Blavatsky the greater part of these dialogues will appear as an over elaborate machinery to arrive, sometimes a little fumblingly, at conclusions that have been more clearly and convincingly stated elsewhere. But we should, nevertheless, welcome an idealistic work that will make to philosophers and mathematicians an appeal that might not reach them through other channels. As an example, we may quote a passage [chap. XVIII, p. 469] fairly illustrative of the general tendency and style of the dialogues, which may be compared with the quotation taken above from *The Secret Doctrine.* The speaker in this case is the mystic:—

> I said before and I repeat that much, even of Evil, is indispensable and indeed essential to the history of the world-system. . . . If the world-system is worth while . . . . Mephistopheles must have work to do. Obstinately recurring evil is necessary for the attainment of certain forms of good. . . . The imaginal dynamic requires it; our emotional life draws sustenance from it; moral good subsists through the struggle which it implies. . . . Moral good . . . is a feature of the additively creative time-process, an aspect of harmonising innovation that culminates in the Divine Event. The Divine Event itself is above the moral. But the moral is of enormous significance during creative evolution. Well—it presupposes Evil.

We see here that Mr. Fawcett has by conscientious thought arrived at the same conclusion already cited. For his mystic, also, "*malum in se*" as personified in the figure of Mephistopheles does not exist save as the "shadow of light"; and he would probably agree that "one cannot claim God as the synthesis of the whole Universe, as Omnipresent and Omniscient and Infinite, and then divorce him from evil".*

Beyond this we shall find in *The Zermatt Dialogues* other ideas,—somewhat shrouded at times in philosophical and mathematical terminology,—which present the author as all unknowingly rediscovering in his own thought approximations to the fundamental truths that are the basis of theosophical teaching. His views on Time, Creative Evolution, and the "World as Imagination," for instance, need but a slight clarification, and a simpler statement, to become consistent with the interpretations offered by Madame Blavatsky. The interesting and instructive lesson that emerges from this being that the truth lies within ourselves, if we have but the patience and energy to seek it in all sincerity.

And it is in this relation that we may hesitate over our third book *The Interpretation of Religious Experience*, by Dr. Percy Gardner. The word that bulks so importantly behind all that he writes is "faith". Even where he does not actively insist upon its use, we cannot avoid the inference that it is the one responsible factor in his religion. Take such a passage as the following for example:—

> I have kept a diary for many years; and in reading it I find constantly expressed my unfailing conviction that anything which I have done in my life which was good was due to the constant help of God; and that when I fell away, as I so often did, from reliance upon that help my life at once began to slide to a lower level, and my usefulness to diminish.

Here, as indeed throughout his book, we find the chief article of Dr. Gardner's creed is reliance upon some higher power, mentally personified as a helping God, faith in whom is in itself sufficient and final. This article does not eliminate the demand for personal responsibility, since the need for living up to a moral ideal remains; but it severely weakens it. The principle involved, moreover, tends to relegate the authority to the particular version of the Divine attributes contained in the Bible. Moreover we cannot avoid the conclusion that this version of the personal, fatherly God stretching out a helping, sustaining hand

* See more particularly Book I, Part II, chap XI *Demon est Deus inversus* and Book II p. 411 *et seq.* "The Shadow of God". Also *Isis Unveiled*, Book II, chap. X on the Devil Myth.

* *Secret Doctrine* I, p. 413.

to all those who believe in him, (the one essential submission,) definitely involves the conception of the opposing force of evil, and thus of a personal devil. If God is to be figured humanly, as an all-wise father, the Devil will inevitably assume mortal shape, also.

Nevertheless if we would deprecate the shelving of full personal responsibility by this single act of Faith in the anthropomorphic conception that, in the Christian Churches, has taken by slow degrees the place of the original tribal god, Jehovah; we cannot overlook the psychological and psychical importance of the act itself. Quite recently the present writer visited a Benedictine foundation at Buckfastleigh in Devonshire, and saw what seemed to him little less than the miracle of a modern cathedral, built mainly in the Norman style of architecture, which represents the work of but six or seven monks over a period of twenty-five years. Now the sole explanation of that marvel,—for it is no less,—offered by the monk who acted as cicerone, was that this great Abbey Church was a monument to the workers' faith; and we would submit that that statement should be accepted in its full literal significance. For those diligent, inspired workers at Buckfast Abbey the faith was in a particular set of beliefs and doctrines that they could accept without a shadow of doubt—the determining condition. But it is obvious that, say, Dr. Percy Gardner and one of these Benedictines, would differ in some essentials as to the nature of the principles which induced the condition in them variously represented by the results here indicated.

What emerges from this speculation is, firstly, that this form of complete submission of the reasoning faculty to an overwhelming belief produces in some cases an effect that reason itself may regard as miraculous; and, secondly, that the articles of belief must be of a kind that exalts the ethical at the expense of the physical. For Theosophists, we would submit, the primary article of Faith in this relation is the unwavering belief in the Immortal Principle in Mankind, from which will inevitably follow a host of supporting principles that provide not only a complete ethical code but the earnest desire to develop that Principle in the self,—not to avoid the sufferings of Karma, but with a single-minded faith in the power of the underlying Spirit. "There is but one temple in the universe, and that is the body of man," wrote Novalis. "Nothing is holier than that high form . . . . We touch heaven when we lay our hand on a human body!"* Faith in such a creed is less easy of attainment than that in a fatherly God, but once attained in its fullness it will work even greater wonders.

In conclusion we see that these three books of our text all serve to illustrate the abiding religious sense in mankind, but that each of them presents an outstanding weakness. In the iconography of M. de Givry we have a picture of mediæval religion obsessed by the delusions arising from that form of idolatry which demands the physical personification of God and Devil. Dr. Gardner's interpretation of his experience tends to avoid the personal responsibility of the individual by postulating an object of faith which has power to confer righteousness and the remission of sins, the emasculating principle of vicarious sacrifice. And Mr. Fawcett, so bravely wielding the powerful instrument of his reason, is closing an entrance to those secret places of his own being by his lack of faith in the Immortal Principle in man. For we may reason our way to that belief, but we can never hold it in a sense of mystical peace until we have found it in ourselves.

J. D. BERESFORD

* Quoted in *The Secret Doctrine* Vol. I. p. 212.

The Prison. By H. B. BREWSTER, with a Memoir of the Author by Ethel Smyth. (William Heinemann Ltd., London. 6*s.*)

The publication of this book is a labour of love, and, therefore, though somewhat late in the day, it should be noticed. In the Introduction, Dame Ethel Smyth explains how she feels that the philosophy of Brewster ought not to be allowed to fall into obscurity. Hence the reprint of *The Prison.* It is, as it were, a tribute to one who taught her much, an effort to share with others what she has gained.

The reader must decide for himself what it is in the work of Brewster—a man who lived for the greater part of his life in retirement—that inspires in a woman like Dame Ethel a profound reverence, and that evokes from a man like Professor John Macmurray, of London University, an almost exaggerated eulogy. *The Prison* is cast in dialogue form, and discusses among other profound subjects, the notion of the self, the notion of God, personality as the basis of religion. The dialogue is very artificial, and at times irritatingly so, (*vide* p. 48). We must confess our ignorance of the work of Mr. Brewster hitherto. We wonder whether the choice of another specimen of his work would not have been better advised, for we cannot help feeling that the form of *The Prison* will rather tend to put off the reader from examining closely to find some of the good things contained in the work.

S. A.

Water Diviners and Their Methods. By HENRI MAGER. (G. Bell & Sons Ltd., London. 16*s.*)

Water diviners and their methods have been in vogue for centuries and they have been persistently derided and scoffed at by scientists, and persecuted by orthodox and bigoted religionists. But the recent experiments and investigations carried on extensively in France, go to prove that neither scepticism nor persecution was ever warranted, and thus place "dowsing" on a better footing. Our author is of the opinion that the atoms are an "aspect of radiant energy," and it is the manifestation of this energy in atoms and molecules "which affects divining rods," and sensitive instruments. With this as a basis he devised "coloured detectors," "tuning standards," and "interference generators," and carried on his researches which have enabled him to achieve results which were hitherto unattainable. M. Mager's method places the art of "dowsing" on a more scientific basis and dispenses

with the traditional hazel twig. His notion of the atoms is in line with the ancients who held that atoms are "concrete manifestations of Universal Energy".

The book is well worth the study of those who are interested in "dowsing".

L. M.

The Song of the Lord. By EDWARD J. THOMAS. ("Wisdom of the East Series," John Murray, London. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

The Song of God. By DHAN GOPAL MUKERJI. (E. P. Dutton and Co., New York. $ 3.50)

Yet two more translations of the *Bhagavad-Gita*, each written with an Introduction! The number of translations of this Scripture of scriptures is ever on the increase, and these two will serve their purpose like so many others, for they also, while remaining faithful to the text, bring a little variety of interpretation, thus revealing the point of view of their respective authors. Neither of them brings out any quality that is not to be found in other translations; nor do they strike any special note for a reader who is familiar with the numerous renditions—from that of Charles Wilkins, to whom the modern era owes a deep debt of gratitude for introducing it to the *Gita*, down to the present volumes. Like so many others, however, they lack any outstanding quality.

Dr. Thomas shows some familiarity with the eastern esoteric view-point, but his translation and notes indicate only a mental perception of the propositions of the *Gita* philosophy. While he rightly accepts the division of the *Gita* into three compartments, of six chapters each, he fails to see the intimate relation subsisting between them. From a learned philologist-philosopher of a somewhat alien system of thought, whose ideas are not assimilated by practice in daily living, we could not expect a translation with a more intimate insight than that given in this volume. Thankful for small mercies, we rejoice that there are westerners of the type of Dr. Thomas whose minds, if not their hearts, are attracted by the *Gita*.

Turning to the other rendition, that of Mr. Mukerji, we experience the same feeling, namely,—"it is what is to be expected". Those who know his other books will find the same charm of diction and sentiment, as of Hindu atmosphere. Mr. Mukerji is more of a poet than a philosopher, and the poetry of his translation makes up for the lack of metaphysical understanding and mystical insight. Not only his mind but also his heart is touched by the Great Song—but it is his breadth of view which strikes us and not his depth of vision. The translation bears the mark of Mr. Mukerji's endeavour to practise some of the teachings of the *Gita* in his daily life.

To read any translation of the *Gita* in which intelligence or devotion or both are at work, is an act of pleasure and profit, and every reader will feel grateful for the gift of these two volumes.

S. B.

The Story of Civilization. By C. E. M. JOAD. (A. & C. Black Ltd., London. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

This Human Nature. By CHARLES DUFF. (Humphrey Toulmin, London. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

By far the most interesting animal among animals is man, and among subjects by far the most interesting is the study of man. Two of the recent books on this fascinating subject of human progress are *The Story of Civilization* by C. E. M. Joad and *This Human Nature* by Charles Duff. The former is the second volume of the "How-and-Why" Series edited by Gerald Bullett with the aim of building up a library of general knowledge and culture. Civilization is the result of thousands of years of man's upward struggle, and Mr. Joad has succeeded remarkably well in telling its story, touching upon the most salient facts and forces in its creation, within the 94 pages of this little volume. His story is as entertaining as his style is simple. Though man, through centuries of ceaseless strife and struggle, has produced art and religion, science and literature, philosophy, law and ethics, yet the true civilization, concludes the author, still remains an ideal to be attained. If by civilization is meant the process of making man more and more human, then Mr. Duff throws a bomb in the midst of our fond hopes by declaring that in spite of this long and laborious process of civilization, only "the superficial manners of man have changed considerably, but those fundamental instincts and emotions upon which human nature is based have undergone little real change". But what of the future of human nature? Well, answers Mr. Duff, "it will go on and on, and on and on—more or less as before. Manners and morals will change and cultural structure will change, but man and woman will never profoundly change." (By "profoundly" the author means biologically.)

Mr. Duff is a young Irish satirist. *The Handbook on Hanging*, which was published in 1928, won for him his well-deserved literary fame. His new book now under review is not merely a history of human nature, but a most provoking commentary on the follies and frailties of mankind. Since the process of humanization has in reality been the process of making man moral by law, or, in other words, by repression, Civilization appears to Mr. Duff as a sort of a veneer. "While the past of man," writes Mr. Joad, "has been on the whole a pretty beastly business, a business of fighting and bullying and gorging and grabbing and hurting," Mr. Duff declares that even now, when the veneer is removed, —as it was during the Great European War,—we find man, to all intents and purposes, not very far above the level of jungle beasts. After painting a picture of human nature from the remotest past to the nearest present, he leads his readers to conclude that human nature does change;—often for the worse! But in such qualities as spring from the fundamental instincts and emotions pertaining to the existence, the preservation and perpetuation of the species,—as, for example, hunger and sex,—Mr. Duff finds hardly any change whatever in the half a million years in which human beings are supposed to have existed on this earth. In regard to intelligence the author would like to believe that there is evidence of a slight improvement.

Mr. Duff, like Mr. Joad, recognizes that the evolution of civilization is not a steady progress, but that it moves rather in a succession of jerks with periods of relapse as well as of advance. But why is it that nations rise and fall? Why is it that civilizations have not lasted? Because, says Mr. Joad, they were confined to a very few people. Such an answer is certainly not satisfactory. Further, while these authors give the reader the impression that civilization started its eventful course at some particular point, namely, savagery; history informs him that sages and savages have lived in every age, and that cultures and civilizations have their birth, growth and decay. How then is one to account for the regular alternation of ebb and flow in the tide of human progress? Only by the Law of Cycles or Periodicity, answer the Sages of the East. If Reason governs the World, then it must have governed its history also. Events do not merely germinate and unfold, but they have a past which is connected with the present, and a future connected similarly with the present and the past. Eastern thinkers maintain that continuity and unity repeat themselves in all conceivable stages of progress. Research into these periodical renovations, in the light of Oriental thought, might prove a fruitful line of investigation. However, this suggestion apart, we must say that the most unique feature of this stimulating book is Mr. Duff's remarkable and original

method of vitalizing the humdrum and dead facts of history. Indeed, his is a novel way of writing history. His scholarly treatment of the subject,—made alive by his inborn Irish humour and unconventionality, and illuminated by his inimitable irony and keenness of perception,—makes this volume valuable not only as a piece of historical interpretation of human nature but also as a contribution to man's knowledge of himself.

JAGADISAN M. KUMARAPPA

World Chaos. By WILLIAM Mc DOUGALL. (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., London. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Contrary to the current belief fostered by anthropology and allied sciences, it is a known fact among the students of Theosophy that the origins of the ancient religions are not to be traced to ignorance, fear and superstitions of child humanity; but that the underlying truths of all religions are rooted in one harmonious system of philosophy, science and ethics. The fundamental tenet and the supreme fact underlying this ancient concept is that everything in this universe is *living*—that men are not dying bodies but *immortal souls* ever unfolding their inherent powers, and the universe is a growing concern.

The science that "dates from the Copernican revolution" having lost sight of that reality has proceeded in gigantic strides not on the plane of morals but on that of matter. The result is as Prof. McDougall points out that science, and incidentally our civilisation, has not only become "top-heavy" but also "lop-sided". He gives an illuminating picture of this condition and shows the disparity between the study of the physical and other social sciences. The acceleration of physical science; the retardation of biological sciences; and the lag in the elucidation of scientific facts by psychological view-points; to these he traces the present decay of moral tradition as well as of the family. The mechanisation of industry and colossal mass production has resulted in "technological unemployment" and a poverty stricken humanity. The well-being of mankind has not advanced in proportion to man's control over nature. Prof. McDougall desires to restore the equipoise of our civilisation, and to further social sciences by a study of human nature.

Whilst we agree with the author, we wish he had described the "scientific knowledge of human nature" which he would like us to pursue. Unfortunately one cannot rely on modern psychology; it explains the aspirations and affections, the love and hatred, the sacred workings in the soul and mind of the living man so to speak by an anatomical description of the chest and brain of his dead body. Modern psychology, abandoning its materialistic lines, must turn to the ancient oriental psychology.

However, *World Chaos* is a progressive thesis and makes a good starting point for a new orientation by biologists and others.

PH. D.

What Is Mōkṣa? By A. J. APPASAMY, M. A., Ph. D. (Christian Literary Society for India, Madras. Re. 1-12.)

This volume is the third in a series of "Indian Studies," and we learn from the title page that it is based on "The Johannine Doctrine of Life"; that is to say, it is the author's conception thereof. St. John's Gospel, Madame Blavatsky has told us in *The Esoteric Character of the Gospels*, "is purely gnostic"—and therefore in its true interpretation must necessarily be universal.

Among Christians, Indian religion and philosophy are being recognized as too profound to be lightly passed over. They can no longer be disregarded;—can they then be borrowed from and utilized to buttress the Christian creed? Dr. Appasamy thinks they can—and for this reason, that "God has been preparing a way for Himself slowly through

the ages" :—

> Most Christians in India have come to acknowledge that the philosophies and religions of India have not been inspired by the powers of darkness but that through them all can be seen, sometimes clearly and sometimes dimly, the hand of God leading men on. (p. 10)
>
> Like some immense cathedral Christianity will rise in India with that majesty and dignity which are specially its own. Whatever we may take over from Hinduism will be to Christianity what the buttresses are to a cathedral. These buttresses do not constitute the building by any means. (p. 16)

The writer would therefore have his co-religionists "establish helpful contacts with the people around us" in several ways—one of which is the reading of the *Upanishads* and the *Gîtâ*.

> If we know a Hindu guru of spiritual power we should sit at his feet and learn from him. If a deeply religious Hindu friend is in the habit of engaging in meditation at certain times and will allow us, we should meditate with him. When he prays we should pray with him. When he chants his hymns, we should join him. (p. 13)

But Dr. Appasamy makes it clear, in case one should be misled by this apparently tolerant attitude, that :—

> Christianity in India will not become an electic [eclectic?] religion. We are not going to say that we shall take this and that element from Hinduism and Buddhism and Jainism and call the resultant, whatever it may be, Christianity. The uniqueness of Jesus needs to be maintained at all costs. (pp. 15-16) The religion of Christ is unique. That which India contributes in virtue of its age-long and God-guided religious history is a buttress to the great structure. (p. 16)

This attitude is medieval—at once arrogant and superstitious. In these days, among thinking Christians, a different outlook prevails. Having read this we were not surprised to find the author's verdict on Karma.

> A God of Love cannot well place the children whom He loves in the grip of such a mighty law. The whole Christian gospel of forgiveness is a necessary corrective to the doctrine of retribution. (p. 231)

Will Dr. Appasamy expound a philosophy which shows why the Christian God of Love creates souls for illegitimate children and congenital idiots, and does not take measures to improve the criminal and the wicked in His own churches? He may have occult reasons for punishing heathen lands with physical and moral scourges, but there is not one whit less of crime, immorality and social degradation among His Children of the Church; and, by the way, which church belongs to this God of Love? We presume the one to which Dr. Appasamy belongs!

Questions such as the "Oneness of Jesus with God," and the "Nature of Fellowship with God," which are the central theme of this book, are treated with the greatest reverence; but they do not lend themselves to discussion. Those alone who have reached to Divine Union are capable of giving some idea of the experience, and even they are limited by earthly limitations and can only express themselves in terms necessarily inadequate, and in symbols which differ. And long before the establishment of any church, human souls gained Mōkṣa by their own action or karma.

But while orthodox Christianity insists on the uniqueness of its position, and however "tolerantly" it bears with other creeds, this attitude of superiority will form a barrier between man and man—and this no God of Love would tolerate. Be the missionary tactful or tactless, the dividing line is there all the same. He may be the servant of *a* religion; he is not the servant of Religion.

B. A. (Oxon)

Orpheus: Myths of the World. Collated by PADRAIC COLUM, with twenty engravings by BORIS ARTZYBASHEEF. (The Macmillan Company, New York. 21*s.*)

The title "Orpheus" has been given to this book because it is told of that minstrel that he sang of how all things and creatures came into being. But there is no suggestion of any particularly deep significance being attached to Orpheus or the traditions which surround

his name. Of Orpheus Madame Blavatsky writes in her *Glossary*:—

> Esoteric tradition identifies him with Arjuna, the son of Indra and the disciple of Krishna. He went round the world teaching the nations wisdom and sciences, and establishing mysteries.

If this be so, a link is thus established between Indian and Greek traditions, and we see in the figure of Orpheus one to whom had been vouchsafed the Vision of Divine Truth.

We have gone into the matter of the title at this length because the really excellent collation of myths gathered from many, many countries in all parts of the world, seems to mean to the compiler little more than a collection of fairy tales. The tales are beautifully and sympathetically told, as such tales should be, and will be read with pleasure and, we hope, with profit, by many, for it must be remembered that, as Madame Blavatsky says in *Isis Unveiled* (II, 406):—

> Fairy tales do not exclusively belong to nurseries ; all mankind—except those few who in all ages have comprehended their hidden meaning and tried to open the eyes of the superstitious—have listened to such tales in one shape or the other and, after transforming them into sacred symbols, called the product RELIGION !

Is Mr. Colum one of "those few"? We think not. We seek in vain in his introduction, "The Significance of Mythology," to find some key which will unlock the hidden meaning of the tales. Mr. Colum quotes from Jeremiah Curtin, author of *Myths and Folklore of Ireland*, an excellent passage:—

> True myths—and there are many such—are the most comprehensive and splendid statements of truth known to man. A myth, even when it contains a universal principle, expresses it in special form, using with its peculiar personages the language and accessories of a particular people, time, and place; persons to whom this particular people, with the connected accidents of time and place, are familiar and dear, receive the highest enjoyment from the myth, and the truth goes with it as the soul with the body.

But Mr. Colum finds his own definition of a myth by the adaptation of a phrase (in no sense meant by its original writer to be a definition, we think), of Bronislaw Malinowski. The definition runs thus:—"Mythology is made up of stories regarded as sacred that form an integral and active part of a culture."

That, and that alone! Also, the compiler follows Benedetto Croce as guide into including such tales only as contain "matter that can be 'sympathized' with—recognized as being of proper present interest—by readers of to-day".

It was not thus, however, that the ancients regarded Myths. Plato and Horace both appreciated their real significance, the former finding in them vehicles of great truth well worth the seeking, and the latter declaring that "myths have been invented by wise men to strengthen the laws and teach moral truths".

Readers of Madame Blavatsky, herself a profound student of comparative mythology, will find in her works a key to unlock the mysteries of some of the myths which Mr. Colum relates (*e. g.* Prometheus), as well as general guidance for the interpretation of all myths. They will also find that:—

> The abstract fictions of antiquity, which for ages had filled the popular fancy with but flickering shadows and uncertain images, have in Christianity assumed the shapes of real personages, and become accomplished facts. Allegory, metamorphosed, becomes sacred history, and Pagan myth is taught to the people as a revealed narrative of God's intercourse with His chosen people. (*Isis Unveiled* II,406)

We specially quote this, because we would ask Mr. Colum why, if he includes among his myths "Gotama's Attainment," describing the attack on Gotama by the hosts of Mara, he should omit the Temptation of Jesus in the Wilderness. The one is just as much a myth or as true as the other.

The twenty engravings by Mr. Boris Artzybasheef are arresting and decorative. The omission of the preliminary contents is needlessly irritating.

F. E.

ARYAN CULTURE IN EASTERN TURKISTAN

I*

In the last decade of the preceding century and in the first of the present one, unexpected discoveries were made in Central Asia through the expeditions inaugurated by that great Swedish traveller Sven Hedin, and followed up by scholars like Klementz the Russian, Stein the Englishman, Grünwedel and Le Coq the Germans, and Pelliot the Frenchman. Lost and undreamt of civilisations, represented by manuscripts and works of art, were brought to light. Eastern or Chinese Turkistan forming the link between Iran, India and China was the home of these civilisations, which showed the tremendous influence of Buddhism. Manuscripts written in different scripts and in different and unknown languages contain translations of texts pertaining to this religion. One of the new languages was soon proved to be Sogdian. The oldest (first century) documents in it are some private letters now fully edited with translation, notes, and glossary by Reichelt. Then there are some Christian and Manichean and far more Buddhist texts written in three different scripts and in three slightly different dialects.

Before these startling discoveries were made we knew very little about the Sogdian language which is one of the eastern Iranian dialects. Greek authors, Old Persian inscriptions, and the Avesta refer to a country and a people called Sughda, to use the form of the last source, which adds one solitary detail of its being plagued by locusts as its characteristic. However this may be, it is significant or strange that out of the three different forms of the ancient Iranian word *madhakha*, Modern Persian has preserved the Sogdian form *malakh*—it is in this dialect that *-dh-* becomes *-l-*. As to the language of this people in ancient days we have only one notice of Strabo, (Geography XV, 2), where he says that the Bactrians and the Sogdians were nearly identical in speech. (A similar mention is met with in a Chinese source a little later.) Ariane referred to there is formed from the Aryas who cannot be the old Indo-Iranians, but a people in the North-East, of the land Haraiva. The people known as Alani comes from the same term, *-ry-* having become *-l-* among them. This law exists in the language of the Ossetes calling themselves Irons (or rather Ir and their country Iron) and now residing in the west of the Caspian sea. This tongue is really related to Sogdian ; so also the Yaghnobi dialect on the other or original side. But the manuscripts in the Sogdian language, which no longer exists, are discovered in quite another place far from the original home. The Sogdians were very enterprising agriculturists and businessmen. They penetrated far into the north and the east, in eastern or Chinese Turkistan, and in China itself they lived as a foreign colony. For centuries their language was the vehicle of civilisation in these distant parts. It was used as an international language, as a sort of lingua franca. This fact is fully illustrated by the ninth century inscription at Kara Balgassoum in Mongolia, which is bilingual, Chinese and Sogdian. But in Sogdiana itself the language, known there as Suli and in Persia as Sughdi, seems to have succumbed very early to foreign influences. Only Biruni has preserved certain Sugdhi forms of Zoroastrian month-names, and tradition has kept alive the mere name of this along with other Persian dialects,—the words recorded as Sugdhi by Persian lexicographers belong to any of them and not necessarily to Sogdian.

It was Andreas who found out that the dialect fragment published in 1904 by F. W. K. Müller along with other Middle Persian (or Pahlavi) fragments from Turfan was in Sogdian and named it so in that publication. Soon after more texts were brought to Paris, London, Leningrad and elsewhere.

* *Essai de Grammaire Sogdienne*. II Partie. Morphologie, Syntaxe et Glossaire. By E. Benveniste. (Paul Geuthner, Paris. 75 Francs.)

Gauthiot was the first to edit and translate some of the Buddhist texts. He had also proposed to write a grammar of the Sogdian language, but he was able to finish the first part only, dealing with phonology ; his unfortunate death in the Great War put an end to his plan. This has been now carried out by Benveniste. The work was already finished in 1923-24, but later researches are taken into account in the additions, etc., as far as possible. The first chapter deals with the verb ; the second treats of the noun ; the third is taken up with the particles, *i. e.* adverbs etc. After the last chapter on syntax, additions and corrections are given. The glossary includes all the words that are explained in this part as well as in the first part of the work. Till now we had only smaller studies on certain grammatical phenomena in Sogdian. Therefore Benveniste's is the pioneer attempt in many respects ; and as such it is very admirable indeed. Errors of omission and commission cannot be avoided in a case like this, especially when all the materials are not available. Moreover, the grammatical structure of the Sogdian language is not so simple as that of the sister tongue of western Iran, *viz.*, Middle Persian or Pahlavi. Both declension and conjugation are rich in forms which in their turn require explanation. This fact enhances the value of Sogdian from the standpoint of comparative philology, especially with reference to other Iranian languages, old and new. Its study is no doubt essential ; and Benveniste's work is sure to facilitate and further it. Not only Iranists but also Indianists and others will find it interesting because of the varied character of the literary remains that have been hitherto discovered.

II*

A part of the manuscripts brought from Eastern Turkistan (by the aforementioned scholars) are written in the Brahmi (Indian) alphabet. These have preserved two distinct languages. One of them, called Language II in the beginning, turned out to be an Eastern Iranian dialect, now generally styled as the Saka language, but sometimes spoken of as the North Aryan or the Old Khotani language. The other happened to be an independent Indo-European dialect. This is called Tokharian in accordance with a notice in a Turkish translation which is declared to be done from the Tokhri version found along with it. This term is more precisely applied to a particular class of texts, designated as A-texts, whereas for the rest Tokharian-B, or simply Dialect-B, is used. To judge from the nature etc. of the texts, the former is a church language, the latter a living or popular one. There can be little doubt that the people from whom this name is formed are the Toxaroi of the Greeks, the Tukhara of the Indians, and the Tuholo of the Chinese. They called themselves Arshi (Greek Asioi, Chinese Yue-chi) who may have well been the upper or ruling class of the people. According to classical notices they immigrated to Bactria in about 130 B.C. The Chinese sources on Yue-chi relate about their abode on the western frontier of China, east of Khotan, from which they were driven off by the Huns for a time ; and supplement the classical notices about their warlike operations,—driving off the Sakas etc., and founding the Kushan dynasty in India. The latter event proved to be of the greatest importance, inasmuch as the conquerors adopted the fascinating doctrine of Buddha and spread it, mingled with Greco-Bactrian art and civilisation, into their original home, and bequeathed it to their Chinese neighbours. It is this happy combination of the three great Aryan or Indo-European nations, Indian, Persian, and Greek, that we meet with in the discovered treasures of eastern Turkistan, which, it should be remembered, was not Turkistan at that time—the Turks came there long, long afterwards in the sixth century. The manuscript remains of the Tokharians contain translations of Buddhist texts, sometimes also profane works and documents.

* *Tocharische Grammatik*. By W. Schulze, E Sieg and W. Siegling. Gottingen, Germany. (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. RM. 33 [Bound 36.50])

That this Tokharian language belongs to the Indo-European family can be easily seen from its numerals and other typical words like those denoting relations. But the attempt to connect it with the Indo-Iranian or Aryan branch—also because of the name Arshi—has failed. On the contrary, the new language goes with the European group, to judge from its preservation of the vowels *e* and *o* which become *a* in Indo-Iranian, and from its treatment of the palatal gutturals. The interesting group of the labio-velars occurs in three different forms in Tokharian. The declension too offers strange phenomena; whereas the conjugation is comparatively normal. The chief work in the decipherment of this language is done by the French and the Germans, especially by Sylvan Lévi and Meillet, Sieg and Siegling. Besides smaller studies the latter brought out the texts of the A-dialect in a facsimile edition in 1921. Their intention of offering a complete grammar was, however, not translated into action till recently. They wanted to be "slow but certain". In this great task they have received the help of W. Schulze, the well-known comparative philologist of Berlin University.

The authors have given in this work a descriptive, and not a comparative-historical, grammar of Tokharian. This was necessary for various reasons. B-dialect texts are not yet fully edited nor worked through from the standpoint of grammar. In the present work, only the A-texts (not only the published ones, but also the unedited fragments of the Berlin collection) form the basis ; hence it is the grammar of Tokharian proper. Details from the B-texts are quoted only when it was necessary to support the views of the authors or to explain the otherwise obscure forms and words. For this purpose, not only the French publications of Sylvan Lévi and Meillet are used, but also the unedited texts of Berlin and Hoernle (India Office Library, London) collections. As said above, the phonology of Tokharian is not attempted, but all other grammatical details are fully explained in the present work. Meanings of words, whenever ascertained, are given throughout; and so with the help of the verbal index in the appendix and of the word-index at the end one can study for himself the original texts. The promised glossary will take perhaps a very long time to appear.

It is no wonder that this work has been welcomed by recognised authorities. It certainly adds to the lustre of German scholarship. To write such a grammar of a totally unknown language is no ordinary task. It goes without saying that the work is indispensable for all those who are interested in the investigation of the Tokharian language. Similarly it affords a mass of new materials to comparative philologists. And for Sanskritists too it is not without interest: as we said before, the Tokharian manuscripts contain Buddhist texts, and the language possesses a large number of borrowed words from India. For all this we are thankful not only to the authors, but also to the publishers who have brought out this great work in good form in spite of difficult times. We do hope that our public libraries and oriental institutes will not fail to add it to their collections.

As to the other language referred to above, *viz.* the Saka language, we intend to write on another occasion. For the present it is enough to note that most of its literary remains too deal with Buddhist texts. These are published especially by E. Leumann. He has found out new metrical laws from them. A summary of his researches on the subject will be found in his article "Die neueren Arbeiten zur indogermanischen Metrik" published by the same firm in 1924.

J. C. TAVADIA

[J. C. TAVADIA, B. A., PH. D., who contributes this interesting study is a lecturer at Hamburg University. He is also the author of *Shayast-ne-shayast* a Pahlavi Text on Religious Customs, and other researches on oriental subjects.—EDS.]

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"————————*ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."

HUDIBRAS.

One of our esteemed English contributors writing to us a couple of months ago referred to a forthcoming book of J. Middleton Murry—*The Necessity of Communism.* He said that such a man's "interest in Communism (besides being presumably based on some spiritual attitude) foreshadows a more general turning among Western intellectuals to the subject".

Since then we have read Mr. Murry's article in the January *Adelphi* reviewing *Revelations of a Soviet Diplomat*, and now comes his confession of faith, "Why I Joined the I. L. P.," in *The New Leader* (issue of 1st January), the organ of the Independent Labour Party of Great Britain, so ably edited by Mr. Fenner Brockway.

Mr. Murry explains that he is "not a member of the Communist Party" but a Communist, i. e., "a Marxian Socialist," and adds:—

> But to be a Marxian Socialist in England is a different thing from being a Marxian Socialist in Russia. For an Englishman, the inheritor of political democracy, Marxian Socialism must, on Marx's own principles, have a different message from that which it has for a Russian, inured to absolutist autocracy. I am simply an English Marxist, who finds his inspiration in Marx's own conclusion that "England is the only country where the inevitable social revolution might be brought about entirely by peaceful means."

The manifesto is vibrant with a lofty hope and a deep faith; many will share its visions; perhaps, however, as many will see in it signs of devolution. But it certainly is a shadow of coming events for, ever more and more, the *mystically* inclined intellectuals are bound to influence the course of Social reform and Social legislation. While the British public are facing a grave national crisis, and the ordinary politicians and administrators seem disabled for any real constructive labour, men like J. Middleton Murry, R. H. Tawney and L. P. Jacks are influencing the mass mind and making an impress on the mass consciousness of Britain which will count. Such men, for whom principles of life are more vital than considerations of political parties, have a better chance to-day than ever before to work for a realization of the very Theosophical ideal which Shelley had in view when he wrote:—

> In proportion to the love existing among men, so will be the community of property and power. Among true and real friends, all is common; and, were ignorance and envy and superstition banished from the world, all mankind would be friends. The only perfect and genuine republic is that which comprehends every living being . . . . . Once make the feelings of confidence and of affection universal, and the distinctions of property and power will vanish.

Dr. L. P. Jacks, who also, like Mr. Middleton Murry, is one of the honoured contributors to THE ARYAN PATH, opens his January *Hibbert Journal* with a remarkable article entitled "Our Present Need for 'The Moral Equivalent for War'." Pacifists will not quite approve of Dr. Jacks for asserting that no moral equivalent for war exists. He concludes:—

> Dangerous as our state may be in the absence of a moral equivalent for war, it is only made more dangerous by thinking we have found the equivalent when, clearly, we have not. It is certainly wiser to leave it unfound than to set it up in a fictitious form. And unfound I am content to leave it; but on one condition—that the re-education of the human race is vigorously undertaken meanwhile. The equivalent cannot be created by a "policy of planning," any more than a new religion can be invented, though that, too, may be equally needed.
>
> What the re-education of the human race would involve is here too large a question to discuss. But I may say in general that the essence of it would be the breeding and multiplication of great citizens, and the training of them to that high condition of body and mind in which alone they can face the perennial danger that besets civilisation and competently perform the duties incident to democracy.

That our world has not found the moral equivalent for war is not to say that such an equivalent does not exist, nor that it was not used to uphold some civic structure in the long past of the race. Theosophists will say that such an equivalent does exist, but its appeal is not strong enough for men of our iron age; here and there, individuals have realised the power of the goal which demands that "supreme sacrifice" of which Dr. Jacks writes—the sacrifice which does not demand only death, but further demands that man shall *live* to share the woes of his fellows, to help them in their struggle towards Freedom and Truth. Such an Ideal is held up, for example, in the Buddhistic philosophy where Buddhas and Bodhisattvas *renounce* the joys of blessed Nirvana for the sake of the lonely, sore-footed pilgrims on their way back to their *home*, who are never sure of not losing their way in this limitless desert of illusion and matter called Earth-Life. But the "rows" of Dr. Jacks cannot undertake such a task, for such an ideal is beyond the perception of the "rows" of our social army.

Coming nearer to our own times, India has offered in the programme of Gandhiji something that is not altogether beyond the practice of intelligent minds. Satyagraha as a moral equivalent for war is being attempted before our eyes. But, we grant, as Gandhiji himself would, that the triumph of Satyagraha depends upon individuals. Mass proselytism to enlightenment is as impossible as mass progress through political enactment and social legislation—which brings us back to the experiment in Russia,

which has fired the imagination of so many intellectuals in Europe and even in Asia.

William Henry Chamberlin, who was for some years correspondent of *The Christian Science Monitor* in Soviet Russia, writes a most interesting article in the January *Foreign Affairs*, a well-known American Quarterly, on the fate of the individual in Soviet Russia. His article, which shows a keen judicious insight, opens thus: "The individual human personality is fighting a losing battle against heavy odds in Russia to-day."

The article makes a crushing indictment:—

> From the cradle to the grave the life and thought of the Soviet citizen are mapped out for him.

The Young Pioneers and the Union of Communist Youth are wombs of soul-slaves. But not only the youth are under Soviet training—

> The individual personality is attacked from every side by forces which are all controlled from a common centre and which are working in accordance with a prearranged plan to remake the traditional human individualist into a collective man, a citizen of the future communist society. Of course character in every country is shaped by a variety of institutions—home, school, church, books, radio, newspaper, and so on—and critics sometimes see in modern industrialism a potent and even sinister force for the standardization of tastes, habits and thoughts. But there can be no convincing analogy between the loose, jarring and sometimes conflicting influences which operate for the creation of personality in most countries and the closeknit, intense concentration of effort upon the production of a definite type of citizen which goes on to-day in the Soviet Union. . . .
>
> In the field of economic enterprise the individual has received blow after blow. . . .
>
> One last sanctuary of the individual personality, artistic creation, has recently been ruthlessly invaded in Soviet Russia. Pegasus has been firmly hitched to the chariot of the Five Year Plan. The present tendency is not to encourage free flights of individual creative fancy, but to regiment art in all its forms and to place before it definitely propagandist objectives.

It certainly sounds as if the Soviet republican considers it profitable to gain the whole world, even though it be at the cost of his own soul. But he will quickly reply:—"How can I lose something that does not exist? I am going to possess the world that does exist." The Soviet republican is not taught of—

> The unwritten laws divine, immutable
> That are not of to-day or yesterday,
> But abide for ever.

ॐ

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light ! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. III APRIL 1932 No. 4

THREE RULES FOR DAILY PRACTICE

The following is the closing portion, taken from a stenographic report, of a lecture delivered before the Bombay Electric Supply and Tramways Employees' Association, on the subject of the Laws of the Higher Life:—

Our circumstances can be and should be changed and the measure of the change is the measure of human evolution. Take your destiny in your own hands and do not be fooled by appearance or by priest-craft and say "fate". Man is the maker of his destiny. This will lose much of its difficulty if we can see that there is an educative value inherent in all our circumstances. The higher life demands a change in inner attitude: man himself has fashioned in the past his present environment, and his future growth depends upon his right endeavour to live not as a body, not even as a mind, but as a Soul. The teaching of the *Gita* is that even the most sinful of men can cross the ocean of evil in the bark of spiritual endeavour. That is the teaching of the Buddha, who promised the boon of Nirvana to Upali, the barber. That is the teaching of Jesus who referred to the kingdom of Heaven as being within us.

The change in inner attitude results in our perception that we are, within ourselves, Souls, capable of willing, of thinking, of feeling; that as Souls we are in the body and possess a mind so that unlike beasts we may ascertain the real value, *i.e.* the educative value of all things and all people who surround us. This is all the beginning any one needs. A scavanger, a sweeper, a mechanic, a clerk, a genius, all work by the

same principle, all evolve, step by step, by the aid of the self-same Law. The moment this perception, this vision of our environment and of the world at large is gained, that moment the higher life begins. For very many people the process is unconscious and indirect. Asiatic Psychology says: make it a deliberate process.

So begin and change your inner attitude, but do so knowingly, deliberately, self-consciously. See what each event, each object in the environment, each person you contact has to teach you. We require true humility, not mock modesty, to live the higher life. A man who says, "I am humble," betrays himself of the sin of subtle pride. Fix your mental attention on the Soul within and see with the Soul's eye the value of each thing and every being in silent humility.

Now what about the outer practice? Is there nothing to be done in a more practical way, no outer rules to follow? Yes, indeed there is a great deal to be done. But just as the Law about the inner attitude is universal, and applies impersonally to all, so also the Law is the same for all and works its miracle for the poor and the rich, the clerk who does routine toil or the manager who signs letters and cheques! What is that Law? The whole of the manifested universe is a triple expression of Motion, Space, and Time. Motion is causal and Time and its myriads of objects are effects in Space. We might say that Motion produces Time in Space. But let us not go into metaphysics! And yet it is necessary to get this fundamental of metaphysics that every thing and therefore every man in the universe is affected by Motion, Space and Time, and our environment is nothing else but an expression or a manifestation of Space, Time, and Motion or Causation. Therefore we find that the law of the higher life in reference to outer things, events and circumstances is summed up in three Aphorisms and these are: Purity in Causation, Accuracy in Space, and Punctuality in Time. We might say these three are all the Law and the Prophets any one needs to lead a spiritual life, a simple life, a higher life.

Learn the three aphorisms: Purity in Causation. Accuracy in Space. Punctuality in Time. Apply them to your own office work, if you please, and convince yourself that the higher life is highly practical. If Soul life makes you sentimental, dreamy so that you are inaccurate, unpunctual so that you are selfish, and egotistic till you are impure, beware of that Soul life! Much passes off as spirituality in this country, and we have to remember always that he who draws attention to oneself is unspiritual. To be egotistic of one's own riches is unspiritual, but also it is unspiritual to be proud of sack-cloth and ashes! The truly spiritual man must be inconspicuous, must appear as nothing in the eyes of men.

Be pure in all you cause, *i.e.* in all you say and do, in all you feel and think. Four-fold is the world for every Soul. Each one of us moves in four spheres: of thought, of feeling, of speech and of deeds. Apply your trinity to these four things. Be pure and accurate and punctual in your thoughts, in your feelings, in your speech, and finally in your actions. There is a very simple method (all spiritual things are simple because they are straightforward) which is sometimes called the law of elimination. This law eliminates difficulties, pitfalls and obstacles. What is that law? It revolves round the word "Necessity". Don't do that which is unnecessary; don't say that which is unnecessary, ah! this we find difficult; don't feel, nor think, what is unnecessary. The higher life is the simple life because things are simplified. Note, please, it is not simple living as it is commonly understood; there is a different kind of simplicity, that of necessity. That which is necessary for life must be retained and necessities of different people are different.

Apply this law of elimination and watch and be attentive not to indulge in unnecessary things; always and always ask of yourself, "is it necessary to do this, to go to this place or that, to say and speak thus, to feel or think in such a manner?" This will greatly help each one of us to be pure in our motives, to be accurate in the execution of our duties, to be punctual in all our tasks.

To sum up then. First the inner change of attitude which enables us to perceive that each man is a Soul, and is here in the school of life, to learn from his environment which he must improve by evaluating properly all men and beasts and things. To bring about this change a man must convince himself of the power of his own Soul, and then as a Soul he must handle the affairs of his life, endeavouring to do all things with a pure motive, with a thoughtful punctuality and with deliberate accuracy. The marks of the spiritual man are that he does only that which is necessary and does it with a pure motive, correctly, in due place and due time. Many are the difficulties to be encountered and many too the helps to be obtained, but unless a man starts right, he will go wrong a long, long way. The immediate step in front of us is the looking within to find the captain of the sea of life, and then to steer our vessel with the accurate compass, with the punctual chronometer, but above all with that motive of unselfish good weal and desire to serve the passengers, our fellowmen, by taking our own ship to the Haven of Beauty and Virtue, where the Immortals eternally live to bless and to guide the divine Souls of mortal men.

"RIPENESS IS ALL"

[**Max Plowman** is the chief editor of *The Adelphi* and author of more than one volume on William Blake.

During the war, after service on the western front, he resigned his commission, was court-martialled and wrote his apology in a small book, *War and the Creative Impulse*, which acknowledges its indebtedness to Tagore's *Nationalism*.—EDS.]

"O Love, they wrong thee much
That say thy sweet is bitter,
When thy ripe fruit is such
As nothing can be sweeter . . ."

Anonymous Poem of Seventeenth Century

"*Ripe*" is the word, not "*rich*," textually and in point of veracity. Love's *rich* fruit is often bitter; for the senses may flower and come to fruit without ripeness, without that endurance of * "the beams of love" which alone can bring sweetness. The senses are alternately avid for love and dully indifferent: they belong to the flux of existence and have no stability in themselves; but the "sweet" of love is a spiritual essence, which the senses can mediate but which exists independently of them. Indeed, it is to convey this sweetness that the senses exist—like photographic plates that have no meaning apart from the sun.

Learning to bear the beams of love means hanging in the sun until the mellowing rays permeate to the core of the fruit and loosen it from its kernel; for while the kernel adheres the fruit is drawing nourishment from its own centre and is still unripe and bitter to taste. The ripe fruit is wholly permeated by the sun.

By so being, it achieves a suspended moment when it ceases to belong to itself and belongs to the sun; and this moment comes when it has learnt to bear the beams so well, it becomes their incarnation. Yet at this moment there must be a sort of death, as is shown by the fact that the ripe fruit will, if ungathered, begin to rot from this moment. An immense change takes place at the moment of ripeness: the tide of life turns upon itself.

So we, when we know the ripeness of love, cease to live from the personal centres of hunger, desire, comfort and self-gratification. The moment comes when we give up ourselves, when we cease from making a demand upon life and pass from instinctive growth to enjoyment of being. And, come when it will, this is the moment of death and re-birth. This is the moment when the ripeness of love is truly sweet. For we surrender ourselves to the sun of love; we offer ourselves to the beams for their permeation. We love no more from desire, but because we perceive the lovely. And so we ask for nothing, wanting nothing, being more than content with what we perceive.

vide William Blake's poem: *The Little Black Boy*.

It is the moment of imagination; the moment of resurrected life after an often slow and painful death, the moment when the senses are precipitated and the spiritual eye opens.

And what is imagination? Imagination is nothing more nor less than seeing with the eye of God. It is first a ceasing from self—not by asceticism or self-mortification (these are false lights that lure to perversions) but by appreciation of a more desirable than self—by a sense of the lovely that exists in its own right and in complete independence of us—by a sense of the delight we experience in the pure worship of an object so existing—by such a recognition as makes personal desire of no importance.

Imagination is an act of recognition corresponding with the mythical moment of creation when God looked upon his work and saw that it was good. Inversely again, it is the creative moment; for when we truly perceive that which we love, all nature subserves our insight, the senses become the servants of a leader whose bidding they delight to follow. In the moment of imagination we perceive a correspondence which transcends nature: we become one with what we perceive: we are aware of the springs of its life and are conscious that that life has in some beautiful sense a perfect similarity to, and at the same time a perfect dissimilarity from, our own. Naturally and biologically its life of course exists in what seems to be entire separation from us, but by imagination we leap the gulf of natural separation and make the tremendous act of spiritual identification. In the moment of imagination we see living unity expressing itself in endless diversity. And when we truly perceive anything, then a metamorphosis takes place in us whereby we automatically contribute to the life of the thing perceived. For in truth nothing exists which has a purely phenomenal and entirely separate existence, and the act of recognition, whereby we give living validity to what we perceive, is a definite creative contribution to its life.

Some would have it that this is a purely metaphysical theory, but anyone who has had what is a truly mystical experience knows the truth. In the act of imagination we subscribe to the life of what we perceive, not voluntarily but involuntarily, just as the sun subscribes to the life of the earth. Then the consciousness of recognition, which imagination yields, is so pleasing to us that the senses clamour for service, desiring above all things to make an image of that perfection which the eye of vision beheld.

This is the pattern of creation. To be creative is to fulfil the life of man. It is his delight and the true end of life. Whether it be the propagation of children, or

the making of a work of art, or the cleansing of a sewer, the pattern is the same: love continuing to the point of complete self-sacrifice, the death of the self-hood, the birth of imagination, the creative effort to incarnate spiritual life. The very vegetables live according to such a pattern.

MAX PLOWMAN

WHO ARE THE ASWINS?

ASWINS (*Sk.*), or *Aswinau*, dual; or again, *Aswinî-kumârau*, are the most mysterious and occult deities of all; who have "puzzled the oldest commentators". Literally, they are the "Horsemen", the "divine charioteers", as they ride in a *golden car* drawn by horses or birds or animals, and "are *possessed of many forms*". They are two Vedic deities, the twin sons of the sun and the sky, which becomes the nymph Aswinî. In mythological symbolism they are "the bright harbingers of Ushas, the dawn", who are "ever young and handsome, bright, agile, swift as falcons," who "prepare the way for the brilliant dawn to those who have patiently awaited through the night". They are also called the "physicians of Swarga" (or Devachan), inasmuch as they heal every pain and suffering, and cure all diseases. Astronomically, they are asterisms. They were enthusiastically worshipped, as their epithets show. They are the "Ocean-born" (i.e. *space* born) or *Abdhijau*, "crowned with lotuses" or *Pushkara-srajam*, etc., etc. Yâska, the commentator in the *Nirukta*, thinks that "the Aswins represent the transition from darkness to light"—cosmically, and we may add, metaphysically, also. But Muir and Goldstücker are inclined to see in them ancient "horsemen of great renown", because, forsooth, of the legend "that the gods refused the Aswins admittance to a sacrifice on the ground that *they had been on too familiar terms with men*." Just so, because as explained by the same Yâska "they are identified with heaven and earth", only for quite a different reason. Truly they are like the *Ribhus*, "originally renowned mortals (but also non-renowned occasionally) who in the course of time are translated into the companionship of gods"; and they show a negative character, "the result of the alliance of light with darkness", simply because these *twins* are, in the esoteric philosophy, the *Kumâra-Egos*, the reincarnating "Principles" in this Manvantara.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY (*Glossary*)

THE MIRACLES OF JESUS, THE TWIN-CHILD

[Dr. A. Haggerty Krappe, translator of *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist* is also the author of *The Science Of Folk-Lore*. In this interesting article our learned author presents view-points with which all may not agree, but which deserve consideration by every student. We ourselves are not inclined to read mere superstition in the fables of mythology—Greek or Hindu. The similarity perceived by our author, say between the story of Aswins and Ushas and that of Dioscuri and Phormion is due to the similarity of understanding and expression of facts in nature—cosmical or ethnological or anthropological. Can it not be that the recorders of Greek and Hindu myths possessed knowledge lost to us? However, as to the occult mystery connected with the Twins the reader is referred to H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* (especially Vol. II, pp. 121–123) while her note on Aswins preceding this article will clarify the mystery of the Vedic twins.—EDS.]

I. DIOSCURISM

By "Dioscurism,"—a word derived from the common name of the Hellenic twin-gods or twin-heroes Castor and Pollux, the sons of the great Zeus and hence called "Dioscuri," which simply means "Zeus' boys," the Greek equivalents of the Vedic Açvinu—we mean a form of religion that arose out of superstitions connected with twin-births. Twin-births falling, by their very nature, into the wide realm of the "abnormal," the "uncanny," they have attracted unto themselves a sort of superstitious awe that led (and in Africa still leads) to the destruction of at least one of twin-children, often to that of both of them, and to the death or exile of their mother. Conversely, it may lead to their deification, one or both of them being thought to be the offspring of some supernatural being, a god or demon. Hence the existence of twin superstitions all over the earth and of twin divinities, of the type of the Hellenic Dioscuri and the Vedic Açvinu, over a large portion of the earth's surface. I can give only one illustration, which must take the place of many that might be given, referring the reader for the rest to the fourth chapter of my recent book. There certainly is a wealth of ethnographical and anthropological material on which one may draw. In the regions of the Niger, Benin and Upper Dahomey, all twins are regarded with a religious awe even by people belonging to the negro aristocracy of blood or of wealth. They are reputed immortal, possessed by a prophetic spirit and endowed with a hidden power. Princely twins used to be carried from the women's apartments to the market place, declared immortal, and given a special cult that was established in their honour at the command of the king their father. We know sufficiently well that the mortal father of Castor and Pollux—to mention but one classical twin-couple among many—was said to have been a kinglet of Peloponnesus.

Nor were the Semites exempt from such superstitions and their logical consequences. On the contrary, the Old Testament is full of twin legends. I must needs limit myself to the mentioning of a few among the better known. There are the "hostile twins" Esau and Jacob, twins that hate and persecute one another, as do many non-Semitic twins, in accordance with a wide-spread belief that twin hates twin. This theme is repeated a few chapters later (*Genesis*, xxxviii) in the somewhat less well-known episode of Serah and Perez, the twin-sons of Judah who, like Esau and Jacob and like the Hellenic twins Akrisios and Proïtos, actually fell to quarrelling in a prenatal stage of their existence.

There are the B'ne Elohim, the sons of Jahveh, the ancient Hebrew thunder-god, who seduce mortal maidens (*Genesis*, vi) or, in the rabbinic tradition, are seduced by them, or at least by one of them, the fair Na'amah, a form of the Semitic Aphrodite. In no other manner do the Greek Dioscuri seduce the daughter of Phormion and elope with her, and the relations of the Açvinu to Uṣas, in one set of Vedic traditions, are exactly the same. The B'ne Elohim reappear, in a subsequent chapter (*Genesis*, xviii) accompanying Jahveh in a Dioscurophany under the oak of Mamre, accepting the hospitality of Abraham; as do the Greek Dioscuri when they are the guests of Euphorion, of Pamphaos, and of the Eumenides; as do the Hawaian twins, Kane and Kaneloa in more than one tale still current in the islands. They bestow fertility upon Abraham's wife, long past the age of child-bearing, very much as the Açvinu grant a son to a eunuch and render their lost vigour to the old men Vandana, Cyavâna and Atri, as they give a husband to an old maid, convert a barren cow into a milch-cow and generally spread the blessing of fertility and the reproductive powers far and wide, among men and beasts. The same B'ne Elohim accept the hospitality of Abraham's nephew, strike with blindness the odious inhabitants of Sodom, much as Helen, the sister of the Greek Dioscuri, strikes with blindness the poet Stesichorus for having spoken ill of her in his verse. Then they overthrow the wicked cities, just as the Hellenic Dioscuri were said to have ravaged the city of Las.

Lastly, in the Second Book of Maccabees (iii. 26) two handsome youths appear, whip in hand, at the gate of the Temple of Jerusalem and scourge the Syrian general Heliodorus so thoroughly that he has to give up his impious attempt to plunder the sanctuary. The whip, be it noted, is the chief weapon of the Heavenly Twins, of the Vedic Açvinu no less than of the Hellenic Dioscuri.

Dioscurism is thus seen to have been rampant among the Hebrews down to Hellenistic times, as must be inferred from the examples just passed in review, again but a few among many that might have been quoted. One is therefore led to ask the question whether this dioscuric element may not also have played some part, however modest, in the making of the New Testament and the new religion that grew out of it.

II. In the New Testament

At first blush one is inclined to answer the question negatively. For though Dioscurism may have been a living force among the masses of the Jewish people, the official rabbinic religion that was enthroned in Jerusalem keeps a perfect, though no doubt a diplomatic, silence on the religious phenomenon in question. Furthermore, we are disposed, from our training, to see a greater and more intimate connexion between Jesus of Nazareth and the rabbis, at least those of the Pharisee camp, than between his teaching and the survivals of dim superstitions harking back to an almost forgotten past, preserved, at all events, only by the lowly. For however opposed Jesus was to the mechanical and formal cult of the sacerdotal caste of his people, he yet is always seen to combat its representatives with their own weapons, entirely intellectual and derived from the written sources of the Law and the Prophets. Apart from this, Christianity was in its inception a rationalistic, an artificial, religion, as was Islam at a later period, as was Calvinism still more recently. That is, Christianity is as a rule conceived as essentially a reform movement on a rationalistic and slightly socialistic and utilitarian basis, consequently apt to be little given to the cultivation of superstition and survivals from a hoary past.

That this conception is in the main correct, that is, based on solid fact, it would be futile to deny, particularly in view of the Pauline epistles. Yet it behoves the conscientious historian not to neglect altogether two rather important facts: Jesus was not himself a member of the sacerdotal caste but sprung from strata that had little in common with the Sadducee and Pharisee priesthoods. More important still, he came from a region,—Galilee—which cannot by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as entirely or even preponderantly Jewish or even Semitic. On the contrary, nowhere, not even in Samaria, was the alien element, in the form, perhaps, of the residue of ancient Hittite populations, stronger than in Galilee. In these circumstances one may well ask the question whether Jesus' lack of "orthodoxy" may not have been inherited; for King David certainly was not his only ancestor! Nor is this all. In the extant Gospels there flows, side by side with the frank utterances of a rationalistic or even iconoclastic tendency just referred to, still another current which must not be left out of account in any attempt at a synthesis. I refer to the "irrational" element as represented by the "miracles". It is, of course, needless to add that this current flows from an altogether different source. Jesus' sayings may, in their actual form,

be mere "obiter dicta," aphoristic statements generally torn from their original context. That was the fault of the arrangers of the material. Its greatest disadvantage is the fact that it precludes the construction of a genuine biography of the Master, I mean, a synthetic account of the spiritual growth of the *man* Jesus. Yet there is not the slightest reason to suppose that the sayings themselves are apocryphal wholly or even in part. They are no more apocryphal than are Martin Luther's "Table-Talks" or Pascal's *Pensées*. Yet when we come to the supposed "miracles" we touch quite a different source. For in no case can Jesus have had a hand in their recording, and the persons benefited nowhere appear as the witnesses or authorities of such cures. The tradition in question then rests on the testimony of "eye-witnesses" that happened to be, at best, spectators in the midst of excited crowds. In many cases the Gospel report no doubt rests on more or less (usually less) authenticated hearsay. Even the element of deliberated invention must be considered, without our taking the liberty of referring to it as *pia fraus*. For that would be measuring the first century by the standards of the fourteenth or the twentieth. To do justice to those Gospel stories one should compare them with the "miracles" of Apollonius of Tyana, with certain (not all) *omina imperii* recorded by Suetonius, certain tales reported by the credulous Pliny, the cures effected by the king's touch, both in England and France, and, no doubt, also to certain faith cures in still more modern times. "Miracles" of this description do not as a rule distinguish themselves by too great an originality. On the contrary, they usually follow a well-established pattern, as a result of which D. F. Strauss, in the last century, had no difficulty in tracing most of them to Old Testamental models. It remains to be seen whether the one or the other of these "miracles" may not follow a dioscuric pattern, *i.e.*, belong to the type that was originally peculiar to twin divinities.

To what extent are the supernatural powers attributed to Jesus merely the powers with which twin-children are generally credited, seeing that he himself most certainly was a twin? This fact itself, rather imperfectly known, will require a few additional remarks.

The evidence of Jesus' twinship is based upon a very old tradition clearly of Syriac, *i. e.*, Palestinian, origin and represented, above all, by the so called "Acts of Thomas"; but it was also known to some of the ecclesiastical writers of the West, notably Priscillian and Isidore of Seville. According to this tradition, Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary and the twin-brother of Judas surnamed Thomas, *i. e.*, "Twin". This Thomas even orthodox tradition admits to have been a disciple of Christ, the very one who is pictured as an early representative of critical scepticism. But the Syriac "Acts

of Thomas" not only consistently call him the twin-brother of the Lord, but they emphasise his great resemblance with his more illustrious twin-brother, a resemblance so great that, when the real Jesus appears, in the course of Thomas' missionary labours in India, one of the twins is constantly taken for the other. Judas Thomas also is throughout described as of very small stature, in fact, as a dwarf, and we know from other evidence that Jesus was a man of very low stature. Yet the decisive piece of evidence is the very manner in which the Fourth Gospel deals with the disciple Thomas; it not only emphasises his presence among the rest of Jesus' disciples when the Master appears to them after the resuscitation. Such an emphasis would have been uncalled for unless it were to meet the objection: "Why, some one did indeed come to see the disciples; but it was not the resuscitated Jesus, who was really not resuscitated at all, but his twin-brother Judas Thomas, who looked very much like him." To put still more emphasis on the impossibility of such a rational explanation, the evangelist went so far as to make Thomas exhibit that well-known scepticism, thus making it absolutely clear that Jesus and Thomas were actually in each other's presence and in the presence of the assembly of the disciples. That whole scene is then an early attempt to combat and refute an existing objection to the miracle of the resurrection. The Church, as is well known, not only allowed the fact of Thomas having been a brother of the Lord to fall into oblivion, making of him a mere disciple; it also tried to twist the evidence of the surname by arbitrarily translating the Syriac word not by "Twin" but by "Ocean-flood," a palpable nonsense.

The tradition of Jesus and Judas Thomas being twin-brothers is very ancient and was, by the time of the great controversialists, so completely forgotten that it was made use of neither by the enemies of Christianity (such as Celsus), to refute the miracle of the resurrection, nor by the defenders of the humanity of Christ against heretical sects that denied this humanity altogether. Yet it goes without saying that the tradition is not only ancient but genuine, that is, based on an actual fact. For there is, of course, no conceivable reason that could have prompted the Jewish Christians to invent such a circumstance, seeing that it would most effectively have destroyed the dogma of the resurrection in the flesh by furnishing a rational explanation of the supposed reappearance of Jesus after his death. Once Jesus' twinship thus established, it will behove us to inquire into the problem of how far it may have contributed to what may be called the making of a prophet, a wonder-worker.

We are immediately reminded of the African belief that "twins are possessed by the prophetic spirit," *i. e.*, held in a sort of supernatural awe by their fellow-tribesmen. That does not, of course,

mean that all twins are naturally prophets, in Africa or elsewhere, nor that all prophets must be twins; but it may well mean that, if a man had what is called the prophetic gift or calling and at the same time happened to be a twin-child, he may have found it easier to win recognition—a vital factor in the career of any prophet—than would have been the case if he were just an ordinary mortal. I regard, then, Jesus' twinship at the most as an interesting contributory factor to his remarkable success, but by no means as the essential and preponderant one.

III. Miracles

Let us now come to the main question. As has been pointed out above, the "miracles" of the New Testament must be regarded, from the point of view of the historian, as belonging to tradition rather than to history. Furthermore, most of them are quite inconsequential, at least to us moderns: they play more or less the part of the *omina imperii*, that is, they were meant to authenticate the prophetic calling of the Master in the eyes of certain contemporaries of his, who were of opinion that the real prophet had to be also a miracle-worker. The attitude of complete disapproval taken by Jesus towards this curious notion is well known (*Matt.* vii. 38 ff.; xvi. 1 ff.; *Luke*, xi. 29 ff). The Gospels, on this point, no doubt reflect actual history, and the attitude speaks louder in favour of the man Jesus than many a saying of his. Yet it is to be expected that the prophet's twinship should come in for a large part in the rise of this tradition of Jesus the wonder-worker, in view, of course, of the supernatural powers attributed to twins all over the inhabited earth, and it may be well to put together and briefly comment upon the "miracles" that are genuine twin "miracles," *i. e.*, belong to the ancient lore of the Heavenly Twins, both savage and civilised.

There is, first of all, the function of the Twins as divine physicians (*boni medici*). Castor and Pollux, their Christian successors, the saints Cosmas and Damian, the Milanese Gervasius and Protasius (to mention but the most outstanding examples), they all are divine physicians. Cosmas and Damian in particular are still called, in Modern Greece, *hagioi anarguroi*, "the saints who take no fee". The Vedic Açvinu are called *Nâsatyâ*, a word cognate with Greek *neomai*, *nostos*, Gothic *ganisan*, *ganasjan*, Dutch *genezen*, "to cure," *genesheer*, "physician," and meaning "Saviours," clearly referring to this function of theirs. It may well be that if most of Jesus' miracles, certainly the most impressive ones, were along medical lines, it was because he was himself a twin and stepped into the foot-traces of an older tradition, that of the Heavenly Twins as divine physicians.

Among the miracles wrought by Jesus, the curing of total blindness (*Matt.* ix. 27 ff.; xx. 29 ff.; *Mark*, x. 46 ff.; *John*, ix. 1 ff.) is probably the most astounding, in the light of medical science. Yet it is again one of the typical functions of the Heavenly Twins. Thus the Vedic Açvinu cured blindness and, in the great epic, the *Mahâbhârata*, they are invoked to exercise precisely this function. Among the Christian twin-saints, Cosmas and Damian, Gervasius and Protasius, Cantius and Cantianus (to mention but a few) are on record for giving sight to the blind.

Hardly less impressive, though belonging to a different order of miracles is the stilling of the tempest (*Matt.* viii. 23 ff.; *Mark*, iv. 35 ff.; *Luke*, viii. 22 ff.) on the Lake of Galilee. The Master there appears as a typical saviour *in periculo maris*, a characteristic twin feature; witness the great rôle of the Hellenic Dioscuri in the famous Homeric Hymn, in Theocritus, and in Horace; witness also the like function of the Vedic Açvinu.

The name of the Lake of Galilee brings to mind another "miracle," that of the successful draught of fishes (*Luke*, v. 1 ff.). Off-hand one might be inclined to regard it as a sub-function of the former, both being connected with the sea-faring life of fisher-folk. Yet there are closer parallels, this time "savage" ones. Thus the Tsimshian Indians of British Columbia believe that twins can call the salmon and olachen; hence they are called *Sewihan*, that is, "making plentiful". Among the Nootkas of Vancouver Island twins are believed to be in some way related to salmon, and among the Kwakiutl they are thought to be identical with them. Twins are supposed to attract the fish, and the birth of twins indicates a good salmon year.

The function in question clearly falls within the department of the Heavenly Twins as givers of fertility and plenty, a function known all over the earth and based, ultimately, upon an association of ideas not difficult to understand: twins embody, as it were, the principle of fecundity. Among the "miracles" of this category must be classed the multiplication of loaves and fish, clearly a dioscuric feat (*Matt.* xiv. 13 ff.; xv. 32 ff.; *Mark*, vi. 30 ff.; viii. 1 ff.; *Luke*, ix. 18 ff.; *John*, vi. 1 ff.).

The principle of fecundity is apt to be the preponderant one in the institution of the human marriage, at least in all primitive societies that have not yet come to the realisation of the fact that numerous offspring is not an unmixed blessing. Hence the function of the Heavenly Twins as givers of fertility. The Russian saints Cosmas and Damian are invoked in Russian wedding-songs, as are the Açvinu in the Vedic marriage ritual. In the Syriac "Acts of Thomas" both Jesus and Judas Thomas play a conspicuous part in the wedding of an Indian king's daughter. Judas is invited to enter the nuptial chamber and to bless it and the young couple. If, then, Jesus takes a part in at least one wedding (*John*, ii. 1 ff.), that of Cana, on which occasion he moreover performs a "miracle" falling

into the general category of the Dioscuri as givers of plenty (the water converted into wine), it is not too much to say, I believe, that the tradition again thought of him as a twin first and foremost.

We now approach one of the thorniest problems of Christian tradition, the rise of the dogma of the virgin birth. The oldest sources appear to be altogether ignorant of it, and it is in fact quite certain that Jesus was not the first-born son of Joseph and Mary. How did the idea of a supernatural birth first arise? True enough, there are traces of Old Testamental precedents for it; yet they are just barely recognisable by the student of mythology and folk-lore wielding the weapon of the comparative method. It is therefore likely that it is again the Master's twin character that is directly responsible for it. The fact is that, the physiological causes of twin-births being unknown, many a savage society has drawn the conclusion that either or both of twin-children is the offspring, not of a mortal father, but of some supernatural being, a god or a demon. Thus among the Indians of Guyana the father of one of two twin-children is always a demon called *Kenaima*. Certain negro tribes are of opinion that only one of twins is the offspring of his reputed mortal father, the other having been engendered by some evil spirit. Among many of the South American Indians, including some of the highly civilised peoples of Ancient Peru, one of twins was the son of the Sun, etc. This notion has left numerous traces in Greek mythology. Thus one of the Dioscuri was reputed the son of a mortal, the king Tyndareos, the other being the offspring of Zeus. Herakles was the genuine son of Zeus; his twin-brother Iphikles, however, was regarded as that of a mortal, King Amphitryon of Thebes, whose wife the Olympian had debauched. Of the Vedic Açvinu the one has for a father a mortal called Sumakha, whilst the other is the son of the god of heaven. The examples might be multiplied; but this much will be clear that if Jesus is made to refer to Jahveh as his father and if later tradition actually raised him into a son of God, the ultimate basis, the starting-point, as it were, of this development, is unquestionably his own twinship and one of the many primitive ideas connected with twin-births.

This last point clearly opens up another rather important question, namely: Did Jesus share these notions, and did he foster them, at least in a certain measure? I believe that the question is to be answered in the affirmative, unless we are prepared to deny the historicity of a well-known New Testament episode (*Mark*, iii. 17), where Jesus bestows upon two of his disciples, the twin-brothers John and James, the name of "Boanerges," a word related to the Syriac *B'ne Baraq* and meaning "Sons of Thunder". It is a well-known fact that practically all over the inhabited earth, wherever electric storms occur, human (and often also animal) twins are regarded as the offspring of Thunder or the Thunder-god. Thus among certain Indians of Peru, one of twin-children was considered a son of Lightning, as we learn from the work of a Jesuit missionary, Father Arriaga, writing still in the seventeenth century. Among the negroes of Mozambique, all twins are called *Bana ba Tilo*, "Children of the Sky," the word *tilo* meaning not only the sky but also the common celestial phenomena such as lightning, thunder, and rain. Twin-children and their mother are commonly utilised in rain-charms, and if a thunder-storm becomes altogether too menacing, twins are invoked to intercede with heaven, inasmuch as they are the children of heaven. Zeus, the father of the Dioscuri, is, of course, a thunder-god, and his weapon is the lightning. Among the ancient Balts twins were the children of Perkuns, the Baltic equivalent of the Vedic Parjanya, and, to return to the peoples of Syria, both among the Hittites and the Semitic Syrians twins were the offspring of the thunder-god, the Semitic Hadad, later on generally known under the name of Jupiter Dolichenus. The Master must thus have been familiar with such notions as current in Northern Syria and Palestine and, what deserves to be noted, he cannot have disapproved of them.

That John and James themselves were perfectly aware of the implications of their Dioscurism may be inferred from a passage in *Luke* (ix. 54), where they are ready to command fire to come down from heaven to consume a Samaritan village the inhabitants of which had not shown the proper zeal in receiving their Master. The Old Testamental precedent is not so much a passage in the Second Book of Kings (i. 10-12) as the destruction of Sodom by the B'ne Elohim.

Let us now state, as conservatively as possible, the conclusions that naturally flow from this array of facts. Jesus, himself a twin-child, the twin-brother of Judas Thomas, was associated, by his Galilean contemporaries, mostly men of the people, humble fisher-folk and tillers of the soil, with the powers and functions generally credited, by the ignorant, to twin-children. These beliefs he seems in a certain measure to have shared. What is certain is that these Dioscuric features and functions came to occupy a large place in the oral tradition that arose shortly after his death and that served as a basis for the existing Gospel narratives. The Church, while suppressing the historical fact of Jesus' twinship, could not or would not do away with the many Dioscuric features that loom so large in the Gospel tradition and which, once the original twinship of the Master was rediscovered, would naturally go far in establishing the fact that early Christianity owes much to a religion older by thousands of years, namely Dioscurism, the Cult of the Heavenly Twins.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE

SCIENCE AND PRE-SCIENCE

[**Pramathanath Mukhopadhyaya** is the author of several volumes, among them *An Introduction to Vedanta Philosophy* based on the lectures delivered at the Calcutta University where he was Shreegopal Basu Mallik Fellow in Vedanta. He is also known in the field of Indian journalism. In the following article he shows how modern science is approaching the concepts familiar to students of old Hindu thought.—EDS.]

"One hundred and fifty years of Science have proved more explosive than five thousand years of pre-Science"—thus says a modern philosopher. A statement like this, made by an expert, is very commonly accepted at its face value without actual scrutiny. Yet it may be but a statement of opinion having only meaning and validity in a particular "universe" of convention, and no meaning and validity apart from such special universe. As regards this statement the whole question hinges upon the convention that we may choose to adopt as to the connotations of the words "science" and "pre-science". It can hardly be anything other than scientific bigotry and superstition to maintain that these words must have their meanings assigned to them by one absolute convention, namely, the one decided upon by the modern physical science group.

There is however a distinct sense in which the claim that the science of to-day is more explosive than pre-science may be justified. The science of to-day has now been exploding not only its superstructure but its very foundations. It has been exploding its basis of absolute materialistic and mechanistic determinism. Its vaunted assurance about the nature, laws and working of "matter" has already been profoundly shaken. It still of course pretends to think that it is practically and reasonably sure of its findings of fact, but even a show of pretence that it is absolutely sure of its formulation of fundamentals no longer exists.

Both science, and what has above been called pre-science, have been inspired by a common purpose. Both have essayed to get at the fundamentals to draw a picture of the causal apparatus of the universe we live in, and of which we form a part. While we are no longer permitted to lay our scientific brush on the canvas in a spirit of absolute conviction and arrogant assurance, it is perhaps still open to us to note with tolerable precision the broad, main lines of modern scientific *tendency* in so far as the drawing of a likely picture of the causal skeleton of the physical universe is concerned. We say "physical," merely to keep to the convention of modern physical science. Otherwise, we should never fail to appreciate that the universe we live in is substantially, dynamically and teleologically, one whole indivisible unity.

Now, let us ask—What are the broad, main lines of scientific *tendency* towards a final résumé of the scheme of the physical universe? Negatively, first, science is no longer committed to the position that the basis of the scheme of the universe is "matter" in the sense in which the term was commonly employed. The material basis may be Ether, may be Time-Space, or may be any other thing; but it is not, fundamentally, what is sensed and dealt with as ordinary matter. The latest speculations in connection with the atom tend to show the wave-packet structure of the constituents of the atom, and also their spin round an axis. Secondly, science is no longer in a position to affirm that the Law of Universal Causation, implying necessity and determinism, relates to every event in the physical universe, or to the whole cosmic situation, rigidly excluding both freedom and choice from within, and direction and interference from outside. Determinateness and fixity may be found only in the taking of statistical averages of several individual events, each of which may have a "personal factor," eccentricity, or idiosyncracy of its own. No actual event as such can therefore be pressed whole and entire into any conventional mould—a scientific equation or formula. Only an event that has in a fashion been "treated" or "prepared"—of which all the "irrelevant" items (and scientific relevancy is a matter of convention too) have been pared off—can be scientifically taken cognizance of. As a live whole concrete fact, it is a fact *sui generis*, an incalculable and inexplicable mystery.

The actual concrete movement of a material particle, say that of an electron in its orbit, is never altogether amenable to treatment by the abstract methods of science. Its actual behaviour—showing such "freaks" as "jumping" in its orbit—reduces itself to a problem of probability only, and not to one of absolute certainty. There is fixity and certainty, or an appearance of, and approximation to this, when we come to deal with groups and averages.*

Now, if that be so, does not the actual concrete event of a physical entity suggest that beneath all its elements that are apparently measurable and calculable, there may lurk a nucleus of being-energy which may involve freedom and what must be the basis of freedom—*Ananda* (Joy-Consciousness)? Is it not possible for this nucleus of essence not only to act freely within the range of its given cosmic situation, but also to lay itself open to influences, physical and extra-physical, brought to bear upon it from outside? Physicists already now speak of a sort of nucleus in the constitution of the atom. May not there be more things in the "heaven and earth" of the nucleus of the atom than are yet dreamt

* A reorientation and reinterpretation of the Causal Principle itself is now demanded by the new situation that has arisen in scientific stock-taking and exploration.

of in the latest dreams of physical science? Nobody expects that physical science will presently pronounce its verdict on this. It must not say anything outside its brief, and apart from its record of evidence. But at the same time it must not debar or turn down the possibility to which we have referred. Science now finds herself at the parting of ways—one keeping or seeking to keep it still on the line of materialistic determinism, leading farther and farther into its unending mazes and coils, and the other opening up a new path leading ultimately perhaps to where the old wisdom led ages ago. At such a momentous parting of ways, some degree of doubt and hesitancy may be excusable in science, and any measure of care and caution justifiable.

The nucleus of any physical entity—we are confining ourselves to this for the present—has its freedom limited by the condition of its cosmic situation, and its *Ananda*—Joy—veiled by the scene of its play. It is this veiling and limitation—shewing the empire of Māyā—which makes it a measurable and determinable and therefore, to that extent, a scientific entity. But in another and deeper aspect, it exceeds every measure, and is, therefore, extra-scientific. Ancient thought has recognised ***both*** these aspects. Hindu thought has called the aspect of nuclear freedom of anything its *Karma* and the total assemblage of the conditions of its cosmic situation by which it is hemmed in and determined its *Adṛshta* or *Niyati*. And even a so-called material object has its *Karma* and its *Adṛshta*, or *Niyati*—its Evolution and its Enjoyment.

So much for the implications of the negative aspect of the tendency of modern scientific speculation.

Positively, we find that physical science now tends to the making of a certain picture of the fundamental content of the physical universe, and also of the fundamental modes or forms of the working of that content. We do not of course as yet know what that fundamental content may be in itself. It may be another kind of Ether; it may be Space-Time; it may be some kind of dynamical Field, and so on. We are still working at it. But two things are emerging with increasing clearness. First, we require some sort of a Continuum, and we require some sort of Points or Centres of event or operation in that Continuum. Through and at such Points or Centres, the Continuum is differentiated into specific regions of strain and stress.

In other words, physical science requires a special form of the principle of Continuity coupled with a special form of the principle of Discontinuity. In the last century, Kelvin and Helmholtz had, on hydrodynamic reasonings, thought chemical atoms to be vortex-rings in a perfect fluid—Ether. They had even hinted at the possibility of a superphysical source for such vortices, since in a perfect fluid a vortex can neither be created nor destroyed naturally. Later on, many circumstances connected with the cyclic arrangement of the properties of the chemical elements (*e.g.* the Law of Octaves), with the spectroscopy of the elements, and with radio-activity, indicated that the elements are fundamentally one. Many speculations and experiments towards the close of the last century suggested that there might be no mass other than electro-magnetic mass—a view which favoured what is called the dynamical theory of matter. We possess to-day a fairly agreed picture of the constitution of the atom, and it is expected though there are already new difficulties and new problems to stimulate further exploration and review that the essentials of the picture as drawn by Rutherford, Bohr and others will stand. Let us at least hope so. The essentials of the picture are, first, a nucleus or centre of some kind of dynamism which holds together other bits of some dynamic entity revolving in orbits, thus suggesting some kind of a miniature universe. We have not mentioned electrons and protons—names especially used in this connection. Secondly, it is the number and configuration or diagram of the dynamic entities involved that determine the ***kind*** of atom and the mode of its behaviour. The key-position in the atomic constitution, and therefore in the constitution of the physical universe, is held by Atomic Number—making Number a fundamental factor again in the world, quite in keeping with the teaching of Pythagoras in old Greece, or of the Sāmkhya system in India. Thirdly, the "billiard ball" atom of yesterday has vanished. We have instead an unfathomed mine of incalculable power seated in the atom, some of which is manifested in radio-activity. We now know the material particle as a Magazine of Power. And fourthly, this Magazine works in a way which we do not fully comprehend. We have referred to the "jumping" of the electron already. We might refer to quantum phenomena in general. Energy is seen in operation not as a perfectly continuous stream, but in definite bundles so to say, involving a constant. So we have both substance and energy in little bits. It is not likely that we shall very soon grip the absolutely infinitesimal bit or unit—the *Bindu* or "Point" of ancient mystical thought. We are, however, on the way to it. Meanwhile, we find that in the economy of the atom's life such as we know it there is pulsation—influx and efflux of energy which underlie the phenomena of radiation. This is Atomic respiration, if we may so call it.

Another important indication of present-day science is this—that the causal apparatus of the physical universe, on the whole and in detail, has a diagrammatic structure; which means that all physical objects from the vast galactical system down to the tiny but dynamically great system of

the chemical atom, have not only their framework but also their constituent forces arranged in definite diagrams. Physicists have attempted to reconstruct the geometrical patterns of the dynamical fields not only of bodies in motion but also of bodies apparently at rest. Chemists have been for long shewing us the diagrammatic arrangement of the atoms in a molecule; and we are now told about the "planetary model" of the constitution of the atom itself. The question whether all the varied diagrams can be affiliated to a common fundamental pattern has not yet been answered. We have heard of the vortex-ring atom; we have also heard of the spiral nebulæ. Is it likely that the spiral form compounding the movement of simple rotation with that of translation—combining the ideas of cyclic motion with that of either upward or downward motion—will be found to answer the fundamental cosmic plan? We do not yet know. But we do know already that science has again made the dynamic diagram or *Yantra* fundamental. *Yantra* or "mystic" diagram has ever been a basic conception with Ancient Wisdom. Another basic concept has been *Mantra*, the mystic or dynamic Word. *Mantra* is the Principle of Number or Time, as *Yantra* is the Principle of Extensivity, Magnitude or Space. Modern science is tending to make Number and Geometry, that is, Time-Space, the foundation of its whole structure.

Briefly therefore from the science standpoint, we have, first, some form of a Continuum—Ether, Time-Space, or any other; second, points or centres at or through which a practically incalculable fund of energy works constituting units of physical substance, maintaining the routine of their "normal" behaviour and also conspiring to change and break them; third, the centres or nuclei seem to undergo alternate pulsations of influx and efflux of energy—a circumstance we have called Atomic respiration; fourth, the constituent forces have their appropriate diagrammatic schemes or Yantras, which appear to be cyclic in the typical instances, and may be something like spiral; fifth, the nucleus seems to be a radiating as well as an absorbing centre of energy; sixth, periodicity exists so far as the potential and kinetic states are concerned.

We have seen how some of these positions, tentative as they are, open up lines of approach to some of the deeper teachings of ancient thought. Some other positions are suggestive without yet being actually indicative or confirmative. We shall close with the offer of an ancient but familiar mystic diagram, the meaning of which will, we hope, be easily seen even in the beams of rather unsettled light that have been collected here from modern science.

Suppose for the Continuum we put the ancient concept of the "Causal Waters". It is boundless. But suppose, in order to express the idea of periodicity, according to which pattern of movement the Causal Ocean "moves," we imagine the Continuum enclosed by a serpent holding its tail in its mouth—signifying boundless duration. Then, in order to represent a radiating-absorbing centre or nucleus, let us conceive of a Lotus unfolding in the Causal Waters. Its unfolding shews that it is a point of kinetic potentiality. It is a point for reversing the process likewise. Does not the lotus open in the day and close during the night? Finally (and this in fact is the most significant item) we conceive of a "Swan" brooding over the Lotus. Swan or *Hamsa* means the moving thing, the vital breath, the Sun. It is the Principle of Time, of Number, of *Mantra*, as the Causal Waters imagined as enclosed by a Serpent is the Principle of Space, of Diagram, of *Yantra*. Hindu thought has pictured the Swan as the vehicle of the One to whom was revealed the Word or Veda. It is also the vehicle of Sarasvati, the goddess of Wisdom. The symbol of the Swan does not therefore simply mean that it moves and has "respiration," but that it is the Principle of Control, Inspiration and Direction. The Sun is that in relation to the solar system.

The brooding of the Swan on the Lotus of cosmic evolution means that the process in not simply one of "respiration"—Cycle of influx and efflux—but one of "inspiration," guidance and supervision. It means that the centre of the atom has not only "respiration," but also "inspiration". All ancient cosmogonies say in one form or other that the Spirit breathed forth into the Causal Waters. What is breathed forth is sometimes called *Bija* or Seed. In any case it means that the evolution of the universe—even of the physical universe—is not a blind, unconscious, mechanical process, but that at bottom it is the work of a presiding and informing and energizing Spirit.

Science has not yet come to the idea of Spiritual guidance in Evolution, Atomic inspiration, and all the rest of it. But there is no mistaking that it is now not only standing at the parting of the ways, but is even facing the direction leading thither. The mantra of the savant will be the mantra of the "mystic" when science shall have definitely taken to the way to it—TANNO HAMSAH PRACHODAYAT—*Lead us, O! Kindly Light of Inspiration*

PRAMATHANATH MUKHOPADHYAYA

CHILDREN AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

[**Gwendoline I. M. Carlier, M. Sc.** has made a study of the problem of child delinquency in England and Austria. In the Midlands of England she is in constant touch with the Birmingham Boys and Girls Union, has access to the Juvenile Court, and is a member of the Birmingham Children's Theatre.

Will either home or the League be able to accomplish anything as long as the cardinal fact of life goes unrecognised: that each child is a soul, who, in prior lives has formed its own character and built its own capacities, and reincarnates yet again in a body on earth to further its growth?—EDS.]

Our age is unique in the interest its children excite. All through history the child has been more or less exploited; it has been looked upon variously as a commercial asset, as cheap labour, as a nuisance to its elders or even as a source of pride; it has been snubbed, scolded, sentimentalised over, loved, even; but never till the twentieth century has it been intelligently studied or appreciated at its national (or shall I say its race) value by the consensus of contemporary opinion. There have been enlightened individuals from time to time—witness, for instance, the Czech Komensky (Comenius)—but it has been left to the present century for public opinion to wake up to the importance to the whole community, of child life and child welfare.

The twentieth century has been marked by an immense body of legislation all the world over on behalf of those citizens who carry no political weight, who have no votes, no power of bribery, no influence to exert, no means of advertising their grievances or consciousness that they have any to advertise—the citizens of the future. The Children's Act of 1908, sometimes known—and aptly—as the Children's Charter, was the outward and visible sign of the awakening of the public conscience to a sense of duty to the child population in England, and is a fair sample of this type of legislation. Uneasiness as to the welfare of the world's little ones, which was pretty general in the early years of the century, was augmented by the hard facts which came to light at the time of the Great War, when nations were forced to a bitter realisation of the value of man-power. When men were systematically graded for military service, civilised nations realised with horror the high proportion of unfit in their populations. Peace conditions rammed the lesson well home. Beaten nations, such as Austria, financially crippled as they were, recognised their vital need to conserve what assets they had left and were wise enough to see the value of their children. Bankrupt nations somehow managed to find the wherewithal for clinics, welfare—and training-centres, gymnasia, playing fields and schools on an unprecedented scale.

In general, legislation tends to lag behind the need for it. This is specially true of democracies. The need is there before it is recognised, it is recognised before it is voiced, it is voiced over and over again before it can be satisfied by the making of a law. However, these stages are naturally not experienced simultaneously all the world over, nor are they of equal length. The need for infant welfare legislation may exist for centuries before it is recognised in a community and the time taken to supply it may be short or long according to the system of government in use, not to mention the temperament of the people concerned. Progressive nations attain their "Children's Charter," workable and complete, before some of their neighbours realise that the child has any rights to safeguard. This is where the League of Nations has rendered signal service to the future, and so long as it can initiate and propagate reforms by what Professor Zimmern has described as the "mobilisation of shame" it will remain the great civilising force of the world. The recommendation of the Assembly of the League that all member states apply the principles laid down in the declaration of Geneva has been generally adopted. Its efforts, which are already bearing fruit, to secure drastic regulation of child labour, and what it has accomplished to stop traffic in women and children are too well known to need recapitulation here. The satisfaction of the physical needs of children—food, shelter, protection and healthy conditions generally—is now universally accepted as a duty devolving ultimately upon the state. All signatory powers within the League are alive to these elementary needs of childhood. To procure healthy *material* conditions for children in all circumstances of climate etc., though by no means a *fait accompli*, is comparatively easily achieved by a central body representing all shades of opinion because there can be no disagreement about them. The hungry child must obviously be fed. But a child's needs are not confined to the material, and it is in attempting to cope with the spiritual necessities of childhood that the League finds itself confronted with problems of the highest complexity.

In 1929 the first session of the Child Welfare Committee (reconstituted as such from the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Women and Protection of Children) placed the question of recreation on the agenda of its second session. Naturally there can be no sort of unanimity on a subject so closely bound up with race temperament, ethics and religion. Nevertheless, it has long been recognised that certain widespread forms of amusement contain a menace to child morality and the Child Welfare Committee began, as the result of a report by its Italian member, to enquire into the censorships, if any, exercised by signatory powers over the public exhibition of films.

There has been no such popular educational instrument as the cinema since the invention of printing and no such vehicle for propaganda, however unintentional. Not every film need, or indeed ought to, instruct, but none should be allowed to contaminate. Some nations are so impressed with the insidious evils lurking behind a popular film that they forbid the public cinemas to admit children below a stated age—six in the case of Germany. Others close all cinemas to children and young persons after 8 p.m., Denmark and Norway, for instance. Others again, such as Great Britain, pass certain films for exhibition to adults only. Yet others, such as Japan, forbid the exhibition altogether of a kiss which is considered an indecent act by the Japanese. The committee has not yet completed its work; but it is much to be hoped that it will be able to establish an agreed minimum of decency, to which standard all films passed for exhibition to children must conform. It will be a great pity, however, if the committee has to confine its recommendations to censorship. One or two powers, notably Turkey, have asked for the establishment of a central board in Geneva to recommend good films which are suitable for the young. One of the members of the Child Welfare Committee of the League serves also upon the board of the International Educational Cinematographic Institute, which meets at Rome under League auspices, and may come to supply this demand, which is certainly a hopeful sign.

So far, the League of Nations seems not to have turned its attention to the radio. Here is another powerful instrument of propaganda, instruction and entertainment. The question of censorship does not seem to arise in this connection—let us hope it never may—but it is certainly desirable that more of the ether be devoted to the young people. Here the language problem is an obstacle to any sort of international cooperation as to children's programmes, except as regards music. Still, one day a year, devoted to an international programme, designed to interest and amuse children of all creeds and races, would surely contribute towards universal mutual appreciation and favour the cause of peace?

The spiritual welfare of the child depends upon many things besides education and the right use of its leisure time. Conditions of family life have the strongest influence of all upon the moral well-being of the immature, and these are subject to legislation in all communities and in every state of society. Yet, whereas every race and nation is agreed upon the necessity for a regular system of marriage and whereas the conditions of family life are governed by laws and customs, there is no subject upon which greater divergence of opinion as to what is right and expedient is possible. Marriage and divorce laws are closely bound up with the interests of children, existing and unborn.

Details of all such legislation can only be left to the individual nation to arrange according to its own sense of what is right. There can be no reconciling opposite points of view on such questions, for instance, as birth control. Austria had a League for the Protection of Motherhood, founded in 1926, which is prepared to give advice as to family limitation. In Belgium, also a Roman Catholic country, the opposite opinion is held, and contraception propaganda is made a penal offence. The two points of view, (1) that it is wrong to bring into the world more children than can be given a fair chance of decent life and (2) that birth control is a cardinal sin, comparable to murder, are fundamentally opposed, and it is beyond the power of any League to reconcile them.

The League has already conferred upon the world's children lasting benefits. Its main activities for the near future would seem to lie in the development of the work already begun in the main fields of the physical, mental and moral welfare of all children without regard to race, colour, nation or creed; in raising the standards already set up as civilization proceeds; of encouraging reforms among its enterprising members and shaming its slacker ones into following suit. There is, after all, only a limited number of problems of such universal application as can be brought under the *ægis* of the League.

GWENDOLINE I. M. CARLIER

वासांसि जीर्णानि यथा विहाय
नवानि गृह्णाति नरोऽपराणि।
तथा शरीराणि विहाय जीर्णा-
न्यन्यानि संयाति नवानि देही ॥

Nay, but as when one layeth
His worn-out robes away,
And, taking new ones, sayeth,
"These will I wear to-day!"
So putteth by the spirit
Lightly its garb of flesh,
And passeth to inherit
A residence afresh.

RELIGION AND POVERTY IN INDIA

[**Syed A. Rafique** graduated with honours in philosophy at Cambridge and is now living in England. In this article he touches on a vital problem but offers no solution, perhaps hoping thereby to raise a discussion.—EDS.]

Does religion work for poverty in India to-day? The question is answered in a manner to be followed with rapt attention in the learned but at the same time delightfully written book by Mr. R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, which is concerned for the most part with mediæval Europe. With *Europe*? It does appear to be remote from the subject; yet comparisons between the sixteenth and seventeenth century conditions depicted so interestingly in that work and the nineteenth and twentieth century ones, familiar to us in the Orient, occur at once to the mind.

No doubt the India of to-day differs from the England of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries not only in the variety of her problems but also in her political position and her contending religions. Yet the great questions that confronted the thinkers of England, then, are not unlike those in India, now. During that period in the West, society has changed from a restrained agricultural one based on custom to a competitive commercial one based on entire freedom of contract. Such is the transition taking place in our own country at present. The cotton and jute mills of Bombay and Calcutta are humming with activity and the villager is leaving the isolation of his countryside for the big, commercial towns. As in England some four centuries ago, the wage-earning proletariat is growing in India every day.

In Europe at the beginning of that period, the mediæval divines living in an agricultural society with a manor as the economic unity held that society was an organism composed of different parts, performing different functions, but all aiming towards the achievement of a religious homogeneity. Usury, in its widest sense of interest or dividend on money invested in any form of commercial activity, was frowned upon. The deadly "sin of avarice" included not only extortionate interest but also any exorbitant profits in trade, as by misuse of monopoly or conserving of food-stuff. Even though the all-powerful Mediæval Church countenanced and enforced serfdom—the counterpart of the caste system—on account of her own vested interests, it condemned the sin of avarice in vehement language. In the ensuing period of Puritanism, which followed, the faith of Christ was still confessed and the necessity of interest and enterprise was recongnised only if moderate.

The Mediæval Church counterpart of India is Hinduism but it allows without any restraint interest, speculation and pursuit of unrestrained commerce by the *trading* caste. Problems of Indian economy are not entirely different from those in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as depicted by Mr. Tawney. Pauperism is a grave menace in India. The number of professional beggars is continually increasing. The arguments of the Bombay Municipality against professional beggars, by the way, are similar to those of Calvin who quoted Saint Paul with approval: "If a man will not work neither shall he eat."

The real Puritans of India are followers of a different faith from Hinduism. The democratic institutions of Islam, with recognition of trade not as a lower form of activity, as in Hinduism, but as the highest, are not incomparable with the puritanic and its ancestral Calvinistic conception. Islam is an individualistic religion. Every man has an equal position and status. He is subordinate to none because, like the Puritan of England, he bows his head to God alone. Hinduism, on the other hand, is a communistic religion, *i. e.*, the interests of the individual are subordinated to those of the family, as in the joint family system, and those of the family to the caste.

The trading communities of India are gradually coming under the influence of the unorthodox forms of Hinduism like Arya Samaj and the intellectuals influenced by Western thought, under Brahmo Samaj. Inevitably with the increase of trade and manufacturing on a large scale, the outlook of life must change.

Islam has prohibited, and prohibited effectively, the taking of interest by the faithful. This has kept the Mohammedans out of banking especially, and speculative commerce generally. If even the best Christian conception of the prohibition of interest was rather muddled, the Islamic theologians have defined interest with precision. Participation in trade with merely the capital is allowed, and even advocated, but lending money on security for interest is strictly tabooed. The pressure of necessity, however, is now making inroads on the fortress of Islamic prohibition just as it did in the West a few hundred years before. Means are being invented whereby capital can be supplemented with profits as by the "Mortgage with possession" device.

A theory only accepted in England after considerable controversy is allowed by Islam—complete freedom of contract so that a tradesman may make as much profit as the market can stand. But as state and religion are one in Islam and the notion of brotherly affection and equality not only preached but practised, freedom of contract did not result in the horrors of factory conditions. The compulsory contribution every year to the common chest out of the profits of the trade remedied to a great extent the defects of the competitive system. This contribution or *Zakat*

was not nominal but substantial. The state spent that not on the rich but in providing amenities for the poor. In this indirect way was achieved a good distribution of wealth.

Religion made for poverty in Mediæval Europe. The Church could give no inspiration to the industrial revolution because it had none to give. Is India to go through the whole process of unscrupulous industrialization and then to combat the destructive forces of anarchism as Europe has done? Or are she and her religious thinkers prepared to evolve the right system of Ethics for the business man and introduce the human element into the soul-less competitive system advocated by Adam Smith? What are the prospects?

Hinduism was formulated to suit not a changing but a static society. But India is changing. Again, Hinduism cannot hope to keep the outcasts and untouchables within its fold if commercial activity continues to grow. Already the greatest number of converts to Christianity come from that group. Islam also has no longer the unifying influence of a religious state. It needs revision for it has to substitute for the restraints of the state a code of rigid internal restraints that would make for betterment. If, as Bertrand Russell once said, "Industrialization is a necessity for Eastern countries," it should be carried out as a means for the welfare of society as a whole and not as an end in itself. "Efficiency when worshipped for its own sake," declares Mr. Tawney, "destroys itself." The amelioration in material respects of our country is a religious and not a commercial task. But how, if religion makes for poverty? *That*, so far, is the unanswerable question.

SYED A. RAFIQUE

Karma-Nemesis is no more than the (spiritual) dynamical effect of causes produced and forces awakened into activity by our own actions .... The suppression of one single bad *cause* will suppress not one, but a variety of bad effects .... Unity in thought and action, and philosophical research into the mysteries of being, will always prevent some, while trying to comprehend that which has hitherto remained to them a riddle, from creating additional causes in a world already so full of woe and evil.—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Secret Doctrine*, I. 644

THE PATH AS CONCEIVED BY PLATO

[**Professor Giuseppe Rensi** of the University of Genoa shows how close to ancient Indian concepts were the teachings of Plato, than whom none has influenced more the thought of the West.—EDS.]

Celsus says in his book against the Christians that the Eastern peoples (the Barbarians) are able to discover religious and philosophical doctrines, but that the Greeks alone are able to give them good order. (*Alethes Logos*, I.2.) This seems to hold good with regard to the relation between the philosophic-religious conceptions of the East and Plato's doctrine. Such conceptions had deeply sunk into the mind of Plato; perhaps he had contacted them directly during his journey to Egypt, or indirectly through Orpheism and Pythagoreanism. It is sufficient to remember the eastern theory of reincarnation (which, if Christianity had not prevailed, would have become the common faith of the West), a theory on which Plato built up all his argument in the *Phaedo* and which led him in the *Republic* to the explicit conclusion that it must be the same souls who are always in existence. (*Rep.* 611 A.) But while, at least for the western mind, the eastern philosophic religious doctrines, as originally formulated, are of an indeterminate vastness, and are as confused and tangled as the undergrowth of a jungle, they have acquired that comprehensibility which makes them fruitful for the West, when they have passed through Platonic and Greek thought generally. Almost always the characteristics of a philosophy take colour from the influence of the surrounding world by a process of repercussion on the mind of the philosopher. This is true concerning Plato.* The Peloponnesian War meant to the Greek world exactly what the great European War meant to us. It was from the discontent which the political life of the day caused in him and from his opposition to it that his philosophy was born—not only his moral philosophy but also his metaphysics.

He felt keenly the moral blame attaching to such political life, and also felt it his duty to express his unequivocal condemnation of the rhetorical lies with which petty politicians poisoned the soul of the people, corrupting their ideas of right and wrong; of the shamelessness with which they affirmed that the only right is the will of the powerful and of the ruling faction; of their scandalous misuse of the language of patriotism for their own personal interests, characterised once by Thucydides in these powerful words:—"According to their saying they are anxious for the public welfare, but in reality they prey upon it." It was such ethical

*As regards the early Greek philosophy, this has been well expounded by Jöel, *Geschichte der Antiken Philosophy*, Vol. I.—the only one that has appeared.

condemnation that first aroused in Plato the need to affirm a Right and a Good (not to be transformed and falsified by the words and deeds of men) in opposition to the arbitrary and misleading opinions of those who directed the political parties.* The wounding spectacle of the increasing changes and the turmoil of Greek public life made him feel the need to assert that in opposition to and above this world of change, there was a world of permanent Being, in which we can shelter our minds and our hopes, if we but turn them in that direction.

Thus was born his *real* world, his World of Ideas. These are, on the one hand the most noble longings, the highest aspirations which rule our souls, and on the other hand, the supreme principles and laws which rule eternally the visible and tangible universe and of which it is only the external embodiment. A common soul and the linking together of all Ideas is the final Good. All the principles and laws which govern the universe have one aim, the Being or the Good of the universe itself. For the more and more perfect realisation of these principles and supreme laws, *i. e.*, for the more and more perfect Good of the universe, (*bouletai, oregetai prothumeitai—Phaedo* 74 D., 75 A. and B.) every single phenomenal thing exists. This Idea of the Ideas, then, or the good which supports and attracts to itself all things, first and foremost our souls, is the God of Plato—a God, *not a creator, not almighty.* On the contrary he permeates and orders the universe only according to his best ability (*kata dunamin, kata to dunaton—Timaeus* 30A., 48 C.), and finds opposed to him and not altogether permeable by him the stuff and the necessity, *hyle* and *ananke* (47 E.) source of all evil, while he is one with the Good. (*Rep.* 379 B.C.)

We perceive this inward reality of the universe by a faculty which is not reason, in the usual meaning of that word. It is the faculty which Plato calls *Nous*, in opposition to *Dianoia*, or scientific reason. (*Rep.*, end of Bk. VI.). Just as Kant's *Vernunft* in opposition to *Verstand*, the *Nous* is intuition rather than scientific discoursive reason. It is necessary to give up the rooted prejudice that Plato is an "intellectualist" or even only a "rationalist". To perceive the inward spirituality of the universe it needs an "intuition," a second sight, a sight which sparkles suddenly in our souls as light gushes forth from fire. (*Ep.* VII. 341 C.) Nor is there any rule by which we may gain this sight. It is necessary that the mind should perform a complete *periagoge*, (*Rep.* 518 C., 521 C.) a total revolution, and see in this way. A philosopher is the man who possesses the capacity for this second sight or intuition, and is hence not (as we understand the words) an erudite or a doctrinaire,

* Unfortunately there are still some countries in which for similar reasons the philosophy born of a serious philosophic conscience necessarily acquires an oppositional character.

but the spiritual man (*homo spiritualis*), a stage superior to the reasoning man (*homo sapiens*), and well distinguished from it. Therefore philosophy, is for Plato, neither science nor doctrine, but rather, as æsthetical feeling, something analogous to Dionysiac rapture. "She is the greatest kind of music." (Phaedo, 61 A.) As it is said in the *Jon* (534 A) of poets that they are inspired and possessed, so in the *Symposion* (218 B) is mentioned the Philosopher's "folly," and his Dionysiac rapture.

Philosophy is the fifth of the *maniai* of the *Phaedrus*. A man's soul, when he shall be a philosopher, must be winged and raptured in the height (*Phaedrus*, 249 C); thus the philosopher is "a man beside himself," "divinely exalted," *enthusiazon* (249 D), and to philosophise means to be permeated by the influence (*mousiké*) of the Muses Kalliope and Urania (259 D). As for St. Paul, so also for Plato, the supreme science or *sophia* is identical with the *mania*, namely, the fitness to see in a different manner from others, the divine liberation from the usual way of thinking. (Phaedrus, 265A.)

But if supreme science which allows us solely to see the spiritual reality of the world, namely the world as Ideas, is *Mania*, such also must be, and such is, for Plato, the moral life.

The ethics of Plato are not rationalistic and utilitarian, not an arithmetic of pleasures and pains (as expounded by Socrates in the *Protagoras*). For Plato such ethics are of quite an inferior and vulgar type, *euethé* (*Phaed.* 68 E), and see the definition of *euethé* (in *Rep.* 406 E). In order to be moral the rejection of pleasures and the acceptance of pains must take place, not for the attainment of a higher pleasure but for the attainment of wisdom (*phronesis*)—(*ib.* 69 A.) And of such moral life no one is susceptible save the philosopher, the *homo spiritualis*, the man who is able to perceive that true reality consists not in material worldly appearance, but in the realm of the ideals and Ideas; because only such an one who feels that this is the supremely real world is spontaneously victorious over all earthly temptations and seductions. (*Rep.* beginning of Bk. VI.) Hence arises the Platonic identification of the *deinoi, i.e.*, those who are able to succeed in the world, with the *adikoi, i.e.*, those whe are immoral (*Rep.* 613 B, 405 BC, 409 E), and the antithesis of *deinoi* to *sophoi, i.e.*, the wise and virtuous men. *Phaedrus*, 245 C.) Virtue is therefore a particular of knowing and perceiving reality. It is identical with knowledge, but such knowledge is not intellectualism. It is rather a recognition of the unity of mind, *i.e.*, the knowledge that knowing and wishing are not two separate faculties of the soul; but that the contrary is true. For the way in which we regard reality is the way in which we direct our wish towards it, *e.g.*, to think that wealth or worldly success are important things is the same thing as to wish to have them. Aristotle

makes this thought clear when he says that what in the sphere of intellect is affirmation and denial, that in the sphere of desire is pursuit and avoidance. (*Eth. Nic.* VI. II, 2.)

Virtue, therefore, is knowledge of wisdom, but it cannot be conveyed by teaching. It is an inborn attitude, a ripened wisdom which divine fate gives to some men without the intervention of a process of reasoning, *theiā moirā aneu nou.* (*Meno*, 99 E., cf. *Rep.* 518 B. C.)

Then also virtue is a *mania.* The man who only thinks of his worldly interests, sacrificing if necessary all moral worth for their sakes, the man who follows the theory of Kallikles in the *Gorgias* or of Thrasymachus in the first book of the *Republic*, or these expounded without consent by Adeimantos and Glaucos in the second book, lives rationally because such is the behaviour that is *right* from the world's point of view, and the world crowns it with success. The man who, on the contrary, withstands the temptation of worldly success in order to hold firmly to virtue only does so that he may not soil his soul with unworthy things, but may keep himself clean and holy. (*Gorgias*, 516 E. and see the last part of *Rep.*, Bk. IX.) Marcus Aurelius sums up perfectly and makes his own this Platonic ethic in these words:—"He that does wrong does wrong to himself, for he makes himself bad; the bad man is bad to himself, for he makes himself bad." (IX. 4.) But it must be said of those who entertain such a feeling that they act under the influence of something higher than human reason. (*Rep.* 368 A.) Such a standard of morality is of course only possessed by the few. It is the hall mark of aristocracy in the true sense of the word; and since, for Plato, politics is nothing else than an extension of morals and intimately connected therewith, the character of politics must be of the same high standard.

As a moral individual is one in whose mind *the sophia* rules over the selfish desires (*epithumiai*) by means of volitive energy or *thumós* so the moral State is the State which is governed by men whose minds are ruled by *the sophia*—the wise men, the virtuous men, the *philosophoi.* Such form the Aristocracy of the Platonic State. The essential character of this aristocracy must be, not the thought of enrichment or money (*Rep.* 416 D, 417 D), not the lust for power (520 E. D.) but the acquirement of such only in those countries which respond to the desire for a moral life, those countries alone being their true Fatherland. And this they do from necessity and reluctantly, with no thought that it is an agreeable action, but only that it is necessary. (540 B.) In the spirit prescribed by the *Gita*, they work only for duty's sake, without thought of the action or its results, unattached to both. This ideal of Aristocracy shines ever before humanity; wise politics can have no other end than spiritual and ethical development

of the collective whole, without which all material devices (ports, fleets, fortifications, finance) are but vanities and chattels. (*Gorgias* 519 A, *Alc.*, 134 B.)

Plato has nothing but the most uncompromising moral condemnation for the past and present politics of his country (*Gorgias* 516, *et seq.*). The tyrant (*tyrannikos anér*) is the sink of every vice (*Rep.* Bk. IX), and in almost every Platonic myth concerning the future life tyranny stands first in the list of mortal and inexpiable sins. (*Rep.* 619 A, 615 C; *Gorgias*, 524 E, 525 D; and implicitly also in *Phaedo*, 113 E, because the crimes there spoken of are the crimes of the tyrant.)

But notwithstanding the acute and careful interest of Plato for the individual and society, the thought is always present to his mind that all earthly things are ephemeral and negligible, in that true reality is not to be found in them. At the close of his life his last word was that "men are the toys of Gods" *thauma theios, theou paignion* (*Laws* 644 D, 803 C, 804 B), and to be so is best for them. In the fullness of his virility he has said that wisdom, with the detachment from bodily things which it imposes, is a preparation for death and thus the wise man cannot complain of death, nor can he, contemplating the infinity of Time and Being, prize human life greatly (*Rep.* 486 A). At the noon of his maturity he had declared that evil necessarily hovered round the earth, and therefore that we should fly quickly thence to the dwellings of Gods, striving to become akin to God by justice, holiness and wisdom. (*Theaetetus*, 176 A.)

Plato, for instance, ever held fast the thought that the true life of man is not his individual incarnation on earth, but the absorption of the individual soul into the *psyche pasa* (*Phaedrus* 24 C) or universal soul, which alone is everlasting.

In the *Phaedo* Plato has sought to demonstrate by proof the immortality of the universal mind or universal source of life, *zoes eidos* (106 D); also the passage in the *Phaedrus* (247 C) concerning the heaven wherein the souls who have lived wisely for three incarnations, fly forever (249A), and where they dwell eternally undamaged, *aei ablabé.* (248 C.)

This is Plato's Nirvana.

GIUSEPPE RENSI

THE BEST VERSE IN THE GITA

[**G. V. Ketkar, B. A., LL. B.**, is one of the two founders of the Gita Dharma Mandal, started in Poona in 1924 for the study of the great text and the spread of its teachings. He showed in THE ARYAN PATH for July 1930 how the *Gita* was not merely a Hindu book but was fundamentally "The Book for Humanity". We draw our reader's attention to the Note which is appended to the article.—EDS.]

"Best" is a rather too vague and general term. It has also become hackneyed through indiscriminate over-use by all kinds of propagandists, religious or temporal. So I must explain what I mean by "best" when I say that a particular verse in the *Bhagavad-Gita* is the best of all. I do not mean by it the verse that describes the highest ideal or the greatest secret. If a student looks in the *Gita* for one verse which gives either of these, he will be bewildered if his search is thorough, or misguided if it is partial and cursory.

The Ideal Man is described in the *Gita* in various places, from different points of view. For instance, that of steadying the mind and achieving the inner calm, is apparent in the description of "one confirmed in spiritual knowledge" (स्थितप्रज्ञः) in the second chapter. From the point of view of devotion, the highest kind of devotee (परमभक्तः) is described in the twelfth chapter. From the point of wisdom the ideal man is described in the seventh chapter. We cannot however find one verse which describes the ideal man from all aspects.

If we search the highest secret, we find that the *Gita* does enumerate several things at several stages as "the best of all knowledge" (xiv, 1) "the best secret" (ix, 1) "the most secret teaching" (xv, 20) "wisdom, more secret than secrecy itself" (xviii, 63) and "Supreme word most secret of all" (xviii, 64). It will be too mechanical a process if we go on weighing these epithets from the point of view of their length or intensity and declare for that which weighs most in our opinion. Moreover by such a process different people will arrive at different results. Nor is it proper to say that the highest epithet decides the question in favour of any particular verse.

It is I think by some such process that many people conclude that verse 66 in the eighteenth chapter is the best, because it sounds the highest with a final note "abandon all duties and come unto Me for shelter". (सर्वधर्मान् परित्यज्य मामेकं शरणं व्रज।) Those who select this verse, seem to rely too much upon the fact that the verse comes practically the last in order and is introduced by the epithet "the highest word, most secret of all". (सर्वगुह्यतमं, परमं वचः।)

It may be that they select this verse as the best because it supports their own particular view of

the *Gita*. But this verse follows (v. 63) which says—

> Thus hath wisdom, more secret than secrecy, been declared unto thee by Me; having reflected on it fully, act thou as thou listest.

Thus Arjuna is asked to reflect fully on the whole of the teaching; he is given freedom to act according to his own decision; therefore it seems highly improbable that the core of the teaching could come as if an afterthought. It is, at most, a last appeal. Moreover, this final resignation can be possible only after necessary mastery of knowledge, devotion and works, which is described in detail in the eighteen chapters, and which Arjuna is to consider fully before this last appeal is made to him. No doubt this verse contains the highest secret of devotion or bhakti. But it is one of the three threads in the *Gita*, which are skilfully and inseparably woven together.

From the point of view of Karma or action verse 47 of Chapter II is regarded as the final word. Indeed that verse does summarise in a terse manner the *Gita* attitude towards action. But it only deals with man's relation to action. It does not mention the other two important elements of knowledge and devotion without which the scheme of the *Gita* would be incomplete.

From the point of view of knowledge verses 7 to 11 of the thirteenth chapter may be selected. The last verse in this group summarises the highest state of knowledge as "a resolute continuance in the study of Adhyâtma, the Superior Spirit, and a meditation upon the end of the acquirement of knowledge of truth." (अध्यात्मज्ञाननित्यत्वं तत्त्वज्ञानार्थदर्शनम्।) Devotion is also mentioned in verse 10 as a part of knowledge. Verses 51 to 53 of the eighteenth chapter also give us the highest state of knowledge. But in both places the third element of Karma is not mentioned.

Besides knowledge, work and devotion, there are several other elements that are skilfully blended in a grand synthesis. For instance, the old Vedic sacrifice, which the *Gita* calls material sacrifice (द्रव्ययज्ञः); the technical Yoga of mental and bodily discipline, which is called practice (अभ्यासयोगः); the rituals enjoined by Smritis, which are named (स्वाध्याय-यज्ञः); and several other austerities enumerated by the Puranas, which are classified as (तपोयज्ञः). But these are not subjects treated as prominently as knowledge, work and devotion. Besides we find the existence of these three elements from the beginning to the end of the Path of Perfection (सिद्धिः). This is not the case with others.

To select one verse which describes the best in knowledge, in devotion, or in works and to declare it to be the core of its teaching, is to take a one-sided view of the *Gita*. It is against the spirit of the *Gita*, which condemns one who does not know the whole (अकृत्स्नवित्) or one whose vision is limited (अल्पमेधस्).

By "the best verse," therefore I mean that verse which epito-

mises, combines and harmonises the best in knowledge, works and devotion. Such a verse would show us the way to salvation. No one who has grasped the broad spirit of the *Gita*, can accept any one of the three exclusively as the core of its teaching. Undoubtedly it describes the vitality and viability of the three principles at different stages of life. But its peculiar skill and superiority lies in blending the three in one Path.

With this in view, I think, we can find no better verse than verse 46 of the eighteenth chapter :—

यतः प्रवृत्तिर्भूतानाम् येन सर्वमिदं ततम् ।
स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विंदति मानवः ॥

He from whom is the emanation of beings, by whom all this is pervaded—by worshipping Him in his own duty a man winneth perfection.

The catholicity of the verse is clear. It will be clearer to those who can understand the original Sanskrit, for, it loses much of its significance in the translation. It shows the way in which man (मानवः) can attain perfection (सिद्धिः). The Path of the *Gita* is in essence one for all human beings. The word perfection (सिद्धिः) is a very general word. The highest spiritual ideal can be described in different ways by different people. For each one lays particular emphasis on one or other of the many aspects in which the ideal can be viewed. To one who lays stress exclusively on knowledge the highest ideal is Be-ness (ब्रह्मभाव, ब्रह्मसंस्पर्श, or ब्रह्मनिर्वाण). To a devotee—the state of those who have become one with my nature, (मम साधर्म्यमागताः) those who have come back to my Essence, (मद्भावमागताः). To a believer in works it is to become one with Deity in universe, (सर्वभूतात्मभूतात्मा) or to see God in the Universe (वासुदेवः सर्वमिति). All these aspects are described in their proper context; but in this verse the general and all comprehensive word perfection (सिद्धिः) is purposely used. It is perfection in all the three: works, knowledge and devotion. (कर्म, ज्ञानं, भक्तिः)

Take the attributes of Deity as laid down in the first line of this verse. Various epithets for the Supreme Divine Existence and its manifestation can be found in the *Gita*. But this verse contains the essential primary conception common to all religions and therefore common to humanity. The word (प्रवृत्तिः) "emanation" conveys not only emanation but the whole process of unfoldment which is continuous. The word (ततम्) does not only mean "pervaded," it also means "extended, manifested, permeated and supported". The word (स्वकर्म) "one's own duty" is also a general word. Whatever the society in which a man is born and whatever his own position and circumstances, every man has his natural duties to perform—his function as a unit in society and the Universe. That duty is his own in the sense that it is necessary to him for further development. He is meant for the duty and the duty is meant for him. He can easily see this if he looks at society and the Universe as a field of evolution for all beings through the means of mutual help (परस्परं भावयन्तः श्रेयः परमवाप्स्यथ). A man's duties in Hindu Society were determined by the then prevalent fourfold arrangement of Social co-operation (चातुर्वर्ण्य); but the *Gita* gives sanction to that arrangement only in so far as it gives scope to every man to develop his natural qualities (स्वभावजं कर्म). Therefore one's own duty (स्वकर्म) in this verse cannot be interpreted as the action dictated by others; it is action which is determined by a man himself and which gives scope to the development of his natural qualities and fulfilment of his native aspirations. A narrow meaning is generally attached to one's own duty (स्वकर्म) by confining it to particular Hindu rituals and religious practices which is contrary to the spirit of the *Gita*.

Duty is not only a duty to others but a worship and a self-discipline resulting in increase of knowledge. In order that man's duty may be a worship he must cultivate in him love for the Supreme Self. The first line in the verse gives the relation of Deity with man and the Universe. The second line gives the relation of man with the Deity and the Universe.

There were religious Paths which required complete abandonment of the world and its works for the sake of union with Self. They described the two things—the way of the world and the way to God, as completely incompatible with each other, as incompatible as light and darkness (तमःप्रकाशवत्). The *Gita* brings about reconciliation between these two ways. It shows that the attachment of the ego to objects of sense acts as a hindrance to salvation. Works, if they are done without attachment or selfishness do not obstruct the way of knowledge; on the contrary they help the acquiring and perfection of knowledge. The action contemplated in the *Gita* is purified and made a fit companion to both devotion and knowledge. The key to this process of purifying works with knowledge and devotion is to be found in this verse. Knowledge, works and devotion are brought together in such a way that we cannot determine their boundaries. We cannot draw a line where one ends and the other begins.

The secret of this synthesis of knowledge, works and devotion cannot be found as completely in any other verse of the *Gita* as we find it in this 46th verse of the last chapter. "He from whom is the emanation of beings, by whom all this is pervaded"—(यतः प्रवृत्तिर्भूतानाम् येन सर्वमिदं ततम्)—is the ideal of knowledge; "by worshipping him" (तमभ्यर्च्य) epitomises devotion (भक्ति); "in his own duty" (स्वकर्मणा) indicates the position of works (कर्म); man (मानवः) expresses the broad significance of the *Gita* as guiding all evolution and the general term "perfection" (सिद्धिः) indicates salvation or perfection viewed from all its aspects.

Practically the whole of the *Gita* can be arranged in the form of a commentary of the different words in this comprehensive

verse. It must therefore be said to give the epitome of the *Gita* as far as it is possible to give it in one verse.

G. V. KETKAR

A NOTE ON THE ABOVE

I doubt if it is at all wise or practical to take such futile journey as our brother attempts. But this much may be said: The *Gita* is a book written in what Occultists—Guptas—call cipher. The first principle that cipher seeks to observe, and succeeds most completely, is in making the instruction suitable for *every* one. There is not a man who can fail to understand it if he studies it, nor one who can fail to practise its rules if he resolves. The device employed by Vyasa, the Recorder (one of a very long line) may be described thus: any individual repeatedly reading the *Gita* will discover what to him is the *Bija* or the seed of the *Gita*. The general view that there is but one *Bija* to the Song is incorrect. It might be said with truth, though it might sound an exaggeration, that every verse is a *Bija*—or acts as a *Bija* or seed for some learner. This is the beauty of the cipher. This was purposely devised. From the sinful who comes to a right decision (IX, 30) to the rare high-souled holy one who seeks Vasudeva (VII, 19), all can learn from the book. The eye of the mind sees form behind form in every verse; the ear of the mind hears sound within sound in every verse; and the mental speech intones the same mantra in many ways.

For the class to which your readers generally belong it might be said that verses 34 and 35 of IV will open up a short cut for each to his own *Bija* or seed-verse.

तद्विद्धि प्रणिपातेन परिप्रश्नेन सेवया ।
उपदेक्ष्यंति ते ज्ञानं ज्ञानिनस्तत्त्वदर्शिनः ॥ ३४॥
यज्ज्ञात्वा न पुनर्मोहमेवं यास्यसि पाण्डव ।
येन भूतान्यशेषेण द्रक्ष्यस्यात्मन्यथो मयि ॥ ३५॥

"Seek this wisdom by doing service, by strong search, by questions, and by humility; the wise who see the truth will communicate it unto thee, and knowing which thou shalt never again fall into error, O son of Bharata.

By this knowledge thou shalt see all things and creatures whatsoever in thyself and then in me."

ASIATIC

THE WESTERN NEED OF ZEN BUDDHISM

[**Alan W. Watts** is a rising educator interested in studying the influence of Taoism, Confucianism and Buddhism upon the civilizations of China and Japan.

In our February issue a case was made out for Mahayana Buddhism as being capable of filling a need of the West; below a Westerner, perceiving the failure of the churches, suggests that Zen Buddhism be given a trial.

We have just received the second edition of Mr. Dwight Goddard's excellent *The Buddha's Golden Path*, published by Messrs. Luzac and Co. It is "a manual of practical Buddhism based on the teachings and practices of the Zen Sect, but interpreted and adapted to meet modern conditions". It would seem that more and more Westerners are realizing the necessity of Buddhistic influence to mitigate some of the crying evils of our civilization and to help to solve some of its problems.—EDS.]

> It is not possible, O Subhuti, that this treatise of the Law should be heard by beings of little faith,—by those who believe in self, in beings, in living things and in persons.—*The Diamond Cutter*

A Japanese poet once said:

> The morning glory blooms but an hour
> And yet it differs not at heart
> From the giant pine that lives
> For a thousand years.

In these few words he set forth the greatest truth of Zen Buddhism: that all things—people, animals, trees, worlds, stars—are but transitory aspects of the One Existence, unchangeable, infinite and passionless. All is the manifestation of the Reality ever showing itself in myriads of forms which change unceasingly yet ever remain the same at heart. This is the great teaching of Zen, a form of philosophy which flourishes throughout China and Japan, which holds no scriptures as authoritative but merely tells man to discover the nature of his own existence; in the words of Solon—"gnōthi seauton". Zen teaches man to meditate and in so doing to realize that his innermost being is Being—all else is becoming; that his Being is one with the Being of all others and this unity is common to all. That is to say that the innermost being of all becomings (for we are not outwardly in a state of being) is the One Infinite Reality—a "circle whose centre is everywhere and whose circumference is nowhere". This may sound a vague abstraction—nay! it is the *only* thing that is real and surely it is better than gross anthropomorphism. In the East, Reality is called Buddha, so they say "All is Buddha".

Doubtless we are familiar with the figure of Amida the Buddha; we have seen pictures of his beautiful image at Kamakura in Japan with his smiling face set in such an expression of passionless tenderness and infinite understanding that it touches the innermost core of the heart. The figure is really a personification of the impersonal Reality; in it are

expressed certain spiritual values which correspond to those of the Absolute: passionless tenderness, calm and understanding. These attributes form the "rhythm" which lies at the heart of the Cosmos; the aim of the artist who models the figure is to show us this "rhythm" so that we may make our lives "beat in time" with it.

The "outward" Universe is illusory—it is all cause and effect, for nothing is ever the same for a moment; it is always changing and the changes are ruled by Karma. Our bodies as they now exist are the effect of what they were a moment ago, and what they are now is the cause of what they will be in another moment; we can even go further and say that what we are now is the effect of the whole Universe a moment before. Yet not for the minutest fraction of a second do outward forms cease changing—nothing ever stands still, in fact nothing ever really exists as an outward form at all—one moment it is one thing, the next it is something else. The Universe exists in Time, also an illusion. Therefore it is written: he who hath overcome Time in the past and in the future must be of exceedingly pure understanding.

Zen Buddhism is practical mysticism, it teaches us to find enlightenment within ourselves, and to realize intuitively that "as I am so are these, as these are so am I"; we are not creations of God but manifestations of Life. The enlightened man extends his love to all beings without distinction of high or low, moral or immoral white man or negro, Hindu or Moslem—he pervades the whole Universe with it; for he knows that his Real Self is the All Self.

> At first I sought Pen, Tablet, Heaven and Hell
> Beyond the skies where sun and planets dwell,
> But then the master sage instructed me:
> 'Seek in thyself Pen, Tablet, Heaven and Hell.'

Thus the mystic Omar Khayyam taught the great truth of Zen. Mystics all over the world have found this reality within; St. Catharine of Genoa once said: "My 'Me' is my God"; Emerson described the Universe as "a belt of mirrors round a taper's flame," and the Ancient Egyptians used to say: "The Light is within thee, let the Light shine."

Zen has an excellent influence over the people amongst whom it flourishes. In Japan most of the best art grew up under it—that quiet, exquisite taste which marks Japanese Art is the product of Zen; the *samurai's* code of *bushido*—the way of chivalry—was of its making.* But it is by no means the only religion in Japan, there are a multitude of others; its influence, however, has been all to the good. It is what is wanted in the West—a religion that teaches men to be pure in thought as well as in deed; that does not only say: "Be pure" but teaches *how*. It must be made clear that to wrong another is to wrong self—literally, since all are divine in essence.

The Christian Churches are not

* See *The Japanese Spirit* by Y. Okakura.

satisfactory; they have sunk into bigotry and mendaciousness although there are enlightened men among them. For a great many people they have lost all their meaning except as ancient institutions connected with politics and theological conferences of no immediate use. Perhaps the adherents of the Church of Rome are more sincere than their brethren but their intolerance and insistence on dogma is deplorable.

The West is in great need of something more practical and sincere; the East offers Zen, which if not adopted in the West can at least help Chirstianity to reform itself. Moreover Zen teaches men to think for themselves, something which few people do nowadays either because they will not be bothered or else owing to the tyrannical dominance of the priestly class (especially in Roman Catholic countries)—that class which is responsible for much that is foolish, superstitious, grotesque and terrifying. Millions of uneducated, and even educated people, have been caused heart-rending misery by the doctrine of eternal damnation quite incompatible with the idea of a loving God; this teaching is used to frighten people into the faith and thereby to swell the coffers of the Church.

The coming of Zen Buddhism is the death-knell of triviality; Zen is the religion of a *man* controlled in mind and body as was the *samurai* of old Japan who learnt to face all circumstances with the same imperturbable equanimity. The true follower of Zen never gives way to nervous excitement or foolish sentimentality, he must have stoical calm and must radiate thoughts of love and compassion. In this age when scepticism is growing more and more powerful and the old beliefs in gods and immortal souls are passing away, "we find ourselves in the presence of an older and vaster faith,—holding no gross anthropomorphic conceptions of the Immeasurable Reality, and denying the existence of 'soul' (as we know it in the West), but nevertheless inculcating a system of morals superior to any other, and maintaining a hope which no possible future form of positive knowledge can destroy."* With the coming of this faith the world will realize that all is Buddha—all is potentially enlightened. Then will the wisdom of Confucius be really understood: "Do not to others what ye would not have done unto you by others": for it will have sunk into men's minds that "inasmuch as thou hast done it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, thou hast done it unto *Me*"—the Immeasurable Reality.

ALAN W. WATTS

* From Lafcadio Hearn's *Gleanings in Buddha Fields*.

CHRISTIANITY AND CHRISTIAN SENTIMENT

[**Frank Betts** is an intellectual Socialist more interested in artistic and general social tendencies in the light of Socialist ideals than in direct political advocacy. He was the chairman of the Bradford I. L. P. Education Committee (1926-30) which has published a comprehensive report on educational policy and reform.

During the War Mr. Betts had the courage to publish a translation of the German medieval poet Walther von der Vogelweide—a truly Theosophical gesture.—EDS.]

It is a truism that the hold of doctrinal Christianity on England has weakened. The churches not only lament it, but adopt a defensive and apologetic attitude: they modify their claims on the individual: they feel for modernist restatements of their doctrines and plead guilty to the indictments of Pacifists and Socialists. The Roman Catholic Church is the great exception: but just because of this its adherents stand a little outside the community, and join in the main currents of modern life with reservations of their own.

Surrounding organized Christianity, as a halo surrounds the sun in misty weather, extends the much wider circle of Christian sentiment. It is doubtful if this has weakened at all. Men and women of all grades of culture drop precision of belief and renounce official loyalties: they may never go to chapel; but they cherish a few catchwords which express vaguely their vague aspiration,—"The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man"—and a humanitarianism, which they feel to be inspired by the personality of Jesus of Nazareth. They maintain that an obligation to pity and help, which extends to all races and all animals not definitely noxious, and a certain undefined optimism are the real message of Christ, overlaid by tradition, and organizations. One finds especially in the Socialist movement, which is indeed the inevitable rallying point of English idealism, a widespread belief that the true protagonist of the workers was Jesus, the carpenter's son, "the working class revolutionary," and that the Churches have gigantically betrayed their Master, sold him to the Powers that Be for thirty pieces of silver. His message was personal kindness, and personal kindness, intelligently understood, involves international fraternity and social justice. It is this attitude which for good or evil, gives English Socialism its peculiar character. A similar atmosphere envelops the untiring beneficence of which the Quakers are the leaders, such effort as that of the Save the Children Fund. It was in that spirit that Margaret McMillan carried on her amazing creative work and gave us the Nursery School. On lower levels, among simple folk, it inspires hope, patience, forgiveness and the

astounding munificence of the very poor. Within the Churches one constantly finds all definite teaching and still more all definite discipline, as it were submerged, in a personal love of Jesus of Nazareth and an exhortation to gentleness of life.* As an inspiration to creative effort, the work of social reformer or teacher, this devotion receives from the subjects to which it is applied, a certain saving realism: in the popular hymnology of the day it sinks to a backboneless optimism and an ethic sentimental and feminine beyond belief. At its worst it is all mere compensation for failure in life generally and disappointed eroticism.

All this may be attractive or questionable but it is not in the least like the Christianity of history. If the Christian documents tell us anything at all they bear witness to the personal claims made by Jesus of Nazareth. The utterances which so haunt the imaginations of good people to-day were incidental to a particular context, and the ethics so many profess as an ethic, apart altogether from the mission of Jesus, were the ethics of a brief interim, of men and women who had renounced the world and its creative effort and awaited the imminent return of their Master on the clouds of heaven. When the claims and mission of Jesus were built up into the compact and logical structure of Catholicism these ethics were adapted to a world which, after all, looked like continuing for some little time. Catholicism, and at a later stage Calvinism, were philosophies which claimed to direct with authority, thought and action. They possessed, each in its own opinion, the necessary and saving truth, and accordingly they persecuted, whenever they were able, their opponents. *Indeed it is doubtful whether any Christian community strong enough to persecute, has ever refrained.* This is natural and granted the possession of absolute truth, necessary and right. The teacher of heresy disseminates the most deadly of all pestilences, he is the enemy of souls, the recruiting sergeant of damnation, the most intolerable of all possible criminals. He must be exterminated: to endure him is to share his unspeakable guilt.

These structures, utterly dependent on their logical skeleton of dogma, have undoubtedly included humanitarian elements in their ethical teaching. But all this is secondary to their doctrine: the interests of the Church of God override if necessary all human considerations: heresy is worse than cruelty. And indeed ethically the tendency is to be Puritan rather than humane: unlicensed sexual intercourse is wickeder than inflicting pain: the motive of almsgiving is apt to be sacrifice rather than relief. Especially is Calvinism inhumane in its moral teaching and it is with Calvinism we are more particularly concerned. His-

* But is there not as much of gentleness, kindness and sympathy towards man and beast among "heathens" and "pagans"?—EDS.

torically English religious sentiment is the result of a break-up or rather a deliquescence of Calvinism: so much is obvious. But the completeness of the change is astonishing. There is a continuity of development but there is nothing in common between the beginning and the end of the process. The one reveals logic, pessimism, intolerance not only of intellectual disagreement but of human weakness, an attitude to life intolerably austere and overstrained but genuinely tragic: the other not a weakening of these characteristics but a complete reversal at every point. It is difficult to imagine anything better calculated to disgust an orthodox Calvinist than that perfect expression of Christian sentiment on its lowest level, the popular hymn book "Sankey's Songs and Solos".

There has been clearly some element which has not only acted as a solvent, but which has replaced the original material. To seek it we have to look back to the wars of religion. In the tormented France of the late sixteenth century there appeared the significant group of the Politiques, the men who preferred peace and reconciliation to the good of their own souls, who thought Paris well worth a mass, who blasphemously cried out "a plague on both your houses". These men were the first effective champions of religious toleration, and they championed it because the political madness of intolerance, its obvious hatefulness sickened them of dogmatics. The group included more high-minded and considerate men than he, but the leader who made the successful compromises, who brought about peace, who gave form and substance to the aims of Michael L'Hopitale was King Henri Quatre. It was just because he was so intensely, so comprehensibly human, because he was gay and rather casual and dissolute, because his social ideal was a fowl in every peasant's pot, because he made no claim to intellectuality or austerity that he was, in his own field, able to do as much sheer human good as any king who ever reigned.

But the Politiques, including Henri, were men of the Renaissance. Henri himself knew his Plutarch. They were according to their lights Hellenists: Ronsard the lovely poet who brought at least Alexandrian Greece back to Paris, "the breast of the nymph in the brake, and all the joy before death," though not a Politique by profession was clearly a sympathiser. Who could make verses as golden as Theocritus while people were being burned alive? It is here to be observed that while Catholicism had absorbed considerable elements from Greek culture, and indeed almost recognized Plato and Virgil as fore-runners, Calvinism had rejected exactly those elements in forming its new synthesis. When therefore the drift of men's minds was toward toleration at all costs, it was possible for the Jesuits, by emphasizing the more humane, the Hellenic elements in Catholicism, to build up a culture and attitude which

went far to reconcile the Renaissance-minded to dogmatic religion. The anti-Puritanism which is the popular reproach of the Jesuits is from the humanist standpoint, their true glory.

But in England this reconciliation was more difficult. We had a church which mingled Catholic and Calvinist elements, a virile Calvinist nonconformity and a classical culture. It is true that Hellenism came to Englishmen second-hand—the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries hardly came into direct contact with Greece. The basis of our culture was Latin: Latin literature is largely secondary and derivative, but it derives from Greece. The range of an educated man might be limited, but it included Virgil. Even in the dark ages a humanizing influence, the inspiration of Dante, adored in every generation by some finely touched spirits, Virgil became, in everyday practice, the supreme civilizing force, the poet who actually reached all hearts, who was in fact studied, loved, imitated by everybody who cared at all for things of the spirit during the Renaissance and the centuries that followed it. It was pagan, and only poetry, but as one heard on Sunday of Final Perseverance, the fruitlessness of Works without Grace, and Eternal Damnation, lines learned at school, quivering with uncertainty and obscure hope, came back into the mind, a haunting whisper heard through all the thunders of the pulpit. *Virgil sorrowed with all human suffering, yes and dumb animals also and the very flowers of the field cut down by the unpitying plough.* His message is slow to tell on you: you do not understand your task as a boy and you detest him, and years after odd tags return, coloured with all that long experience has taught you of life: his phrases work upon the movements of the mind, secretly and in silence, and emerge, as it were, changed into a habitual response to loveliness and pity. He is perhaps not the world's greatest poet, but surely in the noblest sense the world's supreme educator.*

It is easy to understand that minds, formed by Virgil, and in some measure by Cicero, did not desire to break altogether with tradition. They learned to doubt, not so much of this or that dogma, but, very gently, of the general validity of dogma: they enveloped their beliefs with a haze of wondering. And they selected from the traditional orthodoxy just those elements which could be made Virgilian, and left the rest as something they had not made their own rather than specifically rejected. What they selected above all were certain sayings of Jesus of Nazareth which had a poetry less complex, but as irresistible, as Virgil's own—gnomes, parables, snatches of conversation which have always gone direct to

*But—whence the inspiration of Virgil? Was he not deeply influenced by the Sibylline Books of old Greece? And what philosophy did these books teach? May it not have been (surely it was so) that Virgil and the "adorable Greeks" but worked up a new expression of their inheritance, which was old?—EDS.

the heart. But the very elements of the Christian tradition which the modern undogmatic Christian most prizes have been selected under the influence of a Virgilian culture: a Westerner hazards the guess that same spirit and culture would have made much the same of Sakya-muni. *What is all important is not the particular leader, the particular organization to which we attach ourselves but the spirit in which we approach it.* We cannot follow out *all* the implications of our spiritual loyalties: the shaping and creative force is that which teaches us, which implication to select as significant, as humane, for our own development. Augustine and Calvin, dogmatists, logicians, rough-hewed their forbidding ends; Virgil and the adorable Greeks behind him have shaped them always in the direction of gentleness, humanity and the love of loveliness. And so it is they who have been and are still, the true benefactors, deliverers, saviours of their fellow-men.

FRANK BETTS

'Tis from the bud of Renunciation of the Self, that springeth the sweet fruit of final Liberation.

To perish doomed is he, who out of fear of Mara refrains from helping man, lest he should act for Self. The pilgrim who would cool his weary limbs in running waters, yet dares not plunge for terror of the stream, risks to succumb from heat. Inaction based on selfish fear can bear but evil fruit.

The selfish devotee lives to no purpose. The man who does not go through his appointed work in life—has lived in vain.

Follow the wheel of life; follow the wheel of duty to race and kin, to friend and foe, and close thy mind to pleasures as to pain. Exhaust the law of Karmic retribution. Gain Siddhis for thy future birth.

If Sun thou canst not be, then be the humble planet. Aye, if thou art debarred from flaming like the noon-day Sun upon the snow-capped mount of purity eternal, then choose, O Neophite, a humbler course.

Point out the 'Way'—however dimly, and lost among the host—as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness.—THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE.

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

THE VIRTUES OF HERBS*

[**H. Stanley Redgrove, B.Sc., F.I.C.,** is a research chemist and author of numerous volumes, the first of which was published so far back as 1909—*On the Calculation of Thermo-Chemical Constants*; othere are *Scent and All About It* and *Blonde or Brunette? The Art of Hair Dyeing.*

The Publication of Mrs. Grieve's book and the interesting remarks of our reviewer thereon, show that western science has made some headway since H. P. Blavatsky wrote in 1877 in her *Isis Unveiled* (II, 589):

> "The corner-stone of MAGIC is an intimate practical knowledge of magnetism and electricity, their qualities, correlations, and potencies. Especially necessary is a familiarity with their effects in and upon the animal kingdom and man. There are occult properties in many other minerals, equally strange with that in the lodestone, which all practitioners of magic *must* know, and of which so-called exact science is wholly ignorant. Plants also have like mystical properties in a most wonderful degree, and the secrets of the herbs of dreams and enchantments are only lost to European science, and useless to say, too, are unknown to it, except in a few marked instances, such as opium and hashish. Yet, the psychical effects of even these few upon the human system are regarded as evidences of a temporary mental disorder. The women of Thessaly and Epirus, the female hierophants of the rites of Sabazius, did not carry their secrets away with the downfall of their sanctuaries. They are still preserved, and those who are aware of the nature of Soma, know the properties of other plants as well."

Will some Indian Pandit follow the example and give us a reliable volume on Indian Herbs—Auṣadhis?—EDS.]

"Excellent Herbs had our fathers of old—Excellent herbs to ease their pain." So run the well-known lines of Rudyard Kipling. One is tempted to ask: Had they? I mean: Had they herbal remedies more efficacious than the drugs used by modern medical science?

There are those who would tell us that there is a magic and a mystery in herbs, known to the ancients, but forgotten to-day. Perhaps Mrs. Leyel, who has edited Mrs. Grieve's monumental work, is of this school of thought. In her Introduction, she refers sympathetically to the Doctrine of Signatures, according to which the utility of each plant for mankind is indicated by some peculiarity impressed on it. Modern medical science will say that the ancients had some very excellent herbs—these are retained by the pharmacopœias of to-day. They had other herbs, useful, but not so good—these have been replaced by more potent drugs. And they believed a lot of rubbish.

* *A Modern Herbal. The Medicinal, Culinary, Cosmetic and Economic Properties, Cultivation and Folklore of Herbs, Grasses, Fungi, Shrubs and Trees, with all their Modern Scientific Uses.* By Mrs. M. GRIEVE, F.R.H.S. With an Introduction by the Editor, Mrs. C. F. Leyel. 2 Vols. With 96 plates. (Jonathan Cape, London. £2. 2*s*.)

I prefer to steer a middle course. Perhaps "middle" is the wrong word, for I shall keep much nearer to the second view than to the first. It is not possible to deny that the great, if eccentric, Paracelsus performed a service of outstanding value to posterity when he married Chemistry (or Alchemy as it then was) to Medicine. He sought for the quintessences, or active principles, of plants, and had the courage to use also medicines derived from the mineral realm.

Nature, however, is so complex, that the mind of humanity cannot assimilate her otherwise than in a piecemeal manner. Progress in understanding must be effected by means of generalisation; but, since no partial generalisation can be quite correct, the mind can proceed only by neglecting certain seemingly small aspects of Nature which, so to speak, won't fit in with its general view of things. This neglect, however, must be only temporary. The mind of the race, if real progress is to be made, must pause, ever and anon, and review the situation. This time has arrived, I think, so far as the science of Medicine is concerned. In short, it would be well, I suggest, to *look over the medical lore of the ancients to see if there are certain facts which, in the general advance of knowledge, have been forgotten.*

This lore is written in their books; but how wearisome is the task which confronts the student who wishes to study it! Would it not be well for us to have a book in which this ancient lore (or what seems of value of it) is brought into relation with the teachings of modern science, and arranged in an easily accessible form?

Now this is the really gigantic task which Mrs. Grieve has essayed; and everyone interested in Herbal Medicine must feel deeply indebted to her for her book. She has succeeded as well, perhaps, as one could expect a single human being to succeed. On what I may term the "modern" side, I notice some omissions and errata; but only the specialist in the very abstruse branch of chemistry devoted to plant-products realises the difficulties of keeping one's knowledge absolutely up-to-date. So rapidly is progress being made, that text-books and works of reference begin to be obsolete the moment they leave the printer's hands, if not, indeed, before. One is compelled to go to the original literature, and, even with the admirable assistance given by the Abstracts published by the American Chemical Society, the task is no light one.

It is often supposed by the lay mind that chemical science has solved all the mysteries associated with the chemical composition of plants and plant-products. Chemical science has done nothing of the sort. We do know a great deal about the various substances present in plants. We certainly do not know everything.

Consider, for example, the question of odour. Chemists have assiduously investigated the substances responsible for the odours

of sweet-scented flowers and other aromatic plant-products, especially with the end in view of reconstructing the "essential oil" responsible for the perfume by synthetic means. In several cases they have almost succeeded—almost, but not quite. There seems always to be something present which eludes analysis. We can write the formula of the perfume of the rose, and, so to speak, recreate this in the laboratory. Yes! It smells very nice. But how much finer is the perfume extracted from the rose itself.

There are those, perhaps, who will say that odour is something ethereal, astral, spiritual. But, to these words used in this manner, I can attach no precise meanings. If we are to use the hypothesis of matter—and, as a convinced epistemological idealist, I find it very convenient—we must be consistent. Only confusion results from labelling one group of sensations "spiritual" in contradistinction from other groups. Much more satisfactory is the hypothesis that the essential oils, to which the odours are due, contain minute traces of substances too small to be detected by chemical means, but which nevertheless we can smell.

In short, as I have pointed out recently, in an article contributed to *La Parfumerie Moderne*, our noses are more sensitive than are the finest chemical balances. And if this is true, may not it be true also that other organs of the human body are equally sensitive? Recent work on the vitamins has demonstrated how potent, in their action for good or ill, minute doses of certain substances may be. Apart from vitamins, is it inconceivable that certain plants should contain traces of other substances equally or even more potent?

I take angelica as an example. Mrs. Grieve's *Herbal* contains an excellent account of this plant (*Angelica officinalis* Hoffm.), which she is careful to distinguish from the common *Angelica sylvestris* L., with which some writers have confused it. Impressive is her account of the virtues attributed to the herb in the past and of the numerous uses to which it has been put. Its very name indicates the high esteem in which it was once held,—this herb of angelic virtue. No doubt there has been much exaggeration; nevertheless, the utility of angelica seems undeniable. Warburg's tincture, the story of which may be read in the second volume of Wootton's *The Chronicles of Pharmacy*, contains the active principles of angelica root and other herbs, in addition to quinine, and appears to have been found more effective in the treatment of agues and malaria than simple quinine without this addition.

The confectioner uses crystallised angelica stems to decorate and to flavour his delicious wares. The manufacturer of liqueurs and bitters values the essential oil obtained from the plant as a decidedly useful flavouring agent.

The perfumer adds the oil in traces to certain of his fascinating compositions. But we search in vain for angelica in the pages of the current edition of *The British Pharmacopœia*. It has lost favour as a drug. Its former reputation, says a modern writer, "is not supported by the disciples of modern chemistry".

If, however, one asks the chemist specialised in this branch of the science, what angelica contains, he is apt to become a little hesitant. The essential oil of angelica root has a somewhat musky aroma, and, until quite recently, chemical science was completely at a loss to account for the musk-like note. The work of Kerschbaum, however, suggests that it may be due to the presence of the lactone of 15-oxy-pentadecylic acid. This substance belongs to the class of many-membered ring compounds recently discovered by Ruzicka, whose work has done much to clear up the mystery of the odours of natural civet and musk; and, incidentally, has produced a little revolution in the domain of Organic Chemistry. I do not think it is known whether these many-membered ring compounds exhibit any form of physiological activity other than their very powerful action on the olfactory nerves; but the inference is obvious that angelica may contain traces of a potent substance of real medicinal value.

Garlic,* again, is another herb neglected by *The British Pharmacopœia*. Yet its real value as an antiseptic seems indisputable. Indeed, one is tempted to suggest that had not the ancient Greeks and Romans been so fond of the bulb, European civilisation would have come to an end: man would have succumbed to the all-conquering microbe. Mrs. Grieve gives a long and interesting account of the virtues of garlic. She records, amongst other facts of interest, that "in the late war it was widely employed in the control of suppuration in wounds".

Regarding the active principle of garlic, it should be pointed out that the essential oil of garlic does not contain allyl sulphide. On the strength of an old analysis by Wertheim, this substance has time and time again been stated to be its chief ingredient. Actually, as Semmler has shown, the main constituent of the essential oil is diallyl disulphide. With this is associated diallyl trisulphide, a disulphide which is probably allyl-propyl disulphide, and probably a higher sulphide.

* Our readers will be interested in the following story of Hippocrates quoted in *Isis Unveiled*, I. 20:

"In some respects our modern philosophers, who think they make new discoveries, can be compared to "the very clever, learned, and civil gentleman" whom Hippocrates having met at Samos one day, describes very good-naturedly. "He informed me" the Father of Medicine proceeds to say, "that he had lately discovered an herb never before known in Europe or Asia, and that no disease, however malignant or chronic, could resist its marvellous properties. Wishing to be civil in turn, I permitted myself to be persuaded to accompany him to the conservatory in which he had transplanted the wonderful specific. What I found was one of the commonest plants in Greece, namely, garlic—the plant which above all others has least pretensions to healing virtues." Hippocrates: "De optima prædicandi ratione item judicii operum magni." I.

To mention but a tithe of the interesting information contained in Mrs. Grieve's book would expand this critique to an enormous length. Few European readers, indeed, will look in the *Herbal* in vain for information concerning any herb with which they are acquainted. Information concerning American herbs has also been included by the author; and the word "herbal," as indicated by the sub-title of the book, has been interpreted in a wide and generous sense.

Not only is the work informative. It is a pleasure to read, and the very excellent illustrations add much to the reader's enjoyment. The manner of editing seems, in some respects, less commendable, and one wonders why the work needed editing at all.

The Editor has arranged the plants under their common names, and has added an Index of these names, a few scientific names being included. The arrangement is a matter of taste; the index, of annoyance. Common plant names are certainly very interesting and often quite charming. They are well worth preserving. But the tendency to overestimate their value and utility must be strongly deprecated. Common plant names are too frequently ambiguous and misleading. They have evidently misled Mrs. Leyel, since she has included a little monograph by Mrs. Grieve on *Hyacinthus nonscriptus* L. (with some alterations) twice, once under "Bluebell" and again under "Hyacinth, Wild". If the present arrangement is adhered to in the next edition, it is emphatically desirable for an Index of scientific names to be added.

The Editor's Bibliographical Note is also a little curious. She states that she has confirmed Mrs. Grieve's facts with those given in certain books. Some are standard works, such as Bentley and Trimen's *Medicinal Plants*—one of those wonderful books for the making of which Science and Art joined hands. But although this is certainly one of the finest works ever written on the subject and of great value to the student, it has to be used very critically. Published so long ago as 1880, many of its "facts" are, of course, obsolete. One wonders, too, why the Editor selected Anne Pratt as her authority for British plants, rather than Sowerby-Syme or Babbington. It would certainly have been more to the point to have included a Bibliography of the works consulted by Mrs. Grieve. Had it been possible to have documented each statement of importance or liable to dispute, the value of the work would have been correspondingly increased; but I realise only too well that to have done this would have made the writing of it unbearably tedious.

It would be easy to select from the monographs of which the *Herbal* consists, many fascinating legends of herbs, which give the work charm as a literary production. I prefer to emphasise its practical importance as a contri-

bution to knowledge; and there is one aspect in which it is of practical value which I must not omit to mention, since this value has become enhanced by recent events.

I have a deep admiration for Mrs. Grieve and the work in which she has been engaged for some years past, in endeavouring to stimulate interest in herb cultivation in Great Britain. Her many pamphlets on British wild herbs of economic value and on herbs easy to cultivate in this country (which have formed the basis of her *Herbal*) are well known and much appreciated by all interested in the subject. They have done much to fill the gap created by the attitude of The Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, which have given little encouragement to prospective herb-growers.

It is, indeed, positively disgraceful that Great Britain should have to import from the Continent numerous herbs which she could easily grow for herself, and in some cases produce in finer quality than foreign countries. The present chaotic state of the national finances may re-awaken interest in this neglected branch of agri-horticulture. Concerning the herbs in question, Mrs. Grieve writes on the basis of her own experience, and everything she has to say is worthy of close attention.

To sum up, I would describe Mrs. Grieve's *A Modern Herbal* as a book of real practical value, which presents many points of interest, ranging from the severely practical to what, by some, may be regarded as highly speculative. It deserves a wide circle of readers, and certainly should find a place in every public library having any claims to importance.

H. STANLEY REDGROVE

PSYCHIC AND NOETIC ACTION

[In our February issue was reviewed by Mr. H. J. Strutton the recently published volume, *Raja-Yoga or Occultism*, a collection of highly important articles by H. P. Blavatsky, in which is included one with the above title. (pp. 51-74) It was originally written in 1890. Modern science is tending more and more in the direction of occult science, of which H. P. Blavatsky was an efficient teacher and exponent. We include the following Notes here for the instruction of all our readers, but especially of those who are serious Theosophical students. These are from the pen of one who has been a student of the writings of H. P. Blavatsky.—EDS.]

In the study of Madame Blavatsky's writings it is important to bear in mind that polarity is a fundamental principle of the ancient science she interpreted for our modern age. This science alone can explain the significance of what physical science has discovered since her time, namely, that polar action is the essence of matter and of all known manifestations of life. It should not be so difficult now as formerly, therefore, to grasp the gist of this philosophy as regards the principles in Man and in Nature.

This article deals especially with human psychology, and it is remarkable how applicable Mme. Blavatsky's criticisms of the psycho-physiology of that period are to the physio-psychology of to-day. Psychologists since then have merely carried the analytical methods of the physical sciences into the realm of sensations and emotions. Psycho-analysis has passed through many phases; but psychologists of whatever school are now all more or less under its influence, as also are so-called "occultists" and the investigators of mediumistic phenomena. They ignore the synthetic principle in man, the experiencing subject of the psychical reactions they examine. This subjective "ego" is the true human mind and does not function in animals, although "Mind" is used by Mme. Blavatsky as a general term for all aspects of Kosmic Mind. (See "Kosmic Mind" *U. L. T. Pamphlet* No. 20.)

Manas, self-conscious mind, connotes the *human* consciousness. It is the active, dual function of *Monas* the Essence of Life; and its especial plane or level of action is far beyond the physical or physiological.

Kama, desire, denotes the typical *animal* consciousness in which desire or craving for existence motives the selective activity. Kamic instincts act automatically without "taking thought". There is no consciousness of time; hence no deliberation, no ratiocination. The animal is not consciously conscious of its experience. There is no "subject" in the sense that a human being realizes "I am I".

Kama is dormant in plant-life which has its own kind of consciousness; and *Manas* is latent in animal life, in the plant, the mineral and in all other states and forms of energy.

The universal Monadic Essence is inherent in all things, visible and invisible, and there is a constant interaction between these two realms: the physical is everywhere penetrated by the ultra-physical. Perhaps the most puzzling paragraphs in this profound treatise are those (a), on p. 68, where Mme. Blavatsky speaks of the *physical* and *metaphysical* action of cells; and (b), on p. 69, where she states that there are *Manasic* as well as *kamic* organs in man.

The first doctrine (a) is illustrated for us by the analogy of light-atoms. Physicists have recently found that the radiations emitted by an "atom"* of light move in two ways. One stream whirls outward from the "field"; the other *moves into* the field beyond observation. The out-flowing "atoms" also emanate di-symmetrical radiations, and the "outward" moving streams gradually condense into chemical states of which terrestrial forms are composed. Thus *the molecules of the latter are magnetically linked through their inner fields to invisible atomic states* from which they emanated, with which they interact interiorly, and by which they are preserved.

The statements (b) regarding specialized organs refer to the inner modifications of organisms, discussed by me in the after-note to "Kosmic Mind". (*U. L. T. Pamphlet*, No 20.) Science knew nothing at all of these interior states when Mme. Blavatsky wrote and she described them as "correlation of forces," (p. 60), as "the *harmony produced by certain combinations of motion*" (p. 61). These inner differentiations, combinations or syntheses, are the work of evolution by which the Monadic Essence evolves out of itself eventually highly differentiated, organized states of its own essence in which Kosmic Mind is polarized. These states constitute the "*higher World* of HARMONY" (p. 61).

Some idea of these interacting, interdependent evolutionary processes is necessary in order to understand Mme. Blavatsky's explanation of Psychic and Noëtic Action; but the conception is difficult to grasp, and more difficult to put into words, especially as we tend to interpret these in terms of our three-

* This "atom" is not a material particle: it is a focus, an immaterial "centre," of energy.

dimensional physical brain. The abstract electromagnetic fields of physics provide very helpful analogies.

The arcane science states that just as there are in the physical world various states of free energies and grades of polarized forms from mineral to man, so the inner complementary world consists of *corresponding*, elementary free states and of "organized" polarized "forms" in different stages of manasic evolution. The interaction between the two worlds is not direct from one to the other in the grades below the human. It is indirect by means of intermediate fields. These inner fields or "systems" may be compared to the overtones of a musical note. When several notes are struck simultaneously there is a mingling of the overtones. Analogously, the human organism strikes all the "notes" of the previous series in the physical scale of evolution and its inner constitution is thus a combination or synthesis of all their overtones as well as of its own special "note" whose octave extends into ultra-physical states.

Man's mind is dual like the "atom" of light ; but he is conscious of this duality because his field of consciousness, unlike that of lower orders, is immediately linked with his real synthetic being—Manas, the active principle of Monadic, or *Self*, consciousness. He has the latent power, therefore, to polarize his consciousness with the universal mind and to control the emanations and selective activities of his mind. But the *kama* of the human *animal* is abnormally stimulated by the close interaction with the higher potency of Manas ; and in man "kama-manas" is more powerful creatively than is Kama, minus Manas, in the purely animal species. Hence the astral or psychic sphere has been polluted by mankind, for men are neither normal animals nor as yet fully conscious mind-beings ; and they misuse their creative power. They appropriate the "inflow" of mental energies for material ends, to stimulate abnormal animal cravings, to satisfy personal desires and egotistical ambitions ; although their true evolutionary destiny is to identify their consciousness with the pure manasic radiations which circulate in supersensible states.

It should be emphasized that the reference on p. 69, to "the spinal 'centre' cord" is not to "Kundalini" as popularly understood by the now numerous would-be "occultists," "kabbalists" and purveyors of secret arts who have spread over the world since Mme. Blavatsky introduced the metaphysical Eastern term to the West. "Centre" here is obviously not a physical centre, nor is *cord* a physiological nerve, for she is referring to *atomic* states.

A little knowledge of the processes and facts of scientific researches would dispel the crude and widely-held idea that it is possible to "transmute" physiological energies into "spiritual forces" by reversing the direction of a current of molecular energy in the organism. Molecular motion does not become atomic by altering its relation to the points of the compass! Each order reproduces its own kind: a plant cannot be converted into an animal, nor an animal *as such* be transformed into a human being.

Man must "reverse his poles" *mentally* and divert his mental energies at their source if he would repudiate his animal consciousness (kama-manas) and become truly human. *Psychic action* must cease before *Noëtic action* becomes consciously effective in creating a Self-polarized manasic Synthesis within or around the physical man.

W. WILSON LEISENRING

The History of the Maya. By THOMAS GANN and ERIC THOMPSON (Scribner's Sons, London. 8*s.* 6*d.*)

A study of one portion of early American civilization seems to be scarcely complete without the inclusion of the whole continent for purposes of comparison.

There are, at once, three features of significance in any study of this subject which strike the thoughtful reader. Firstly, the colossal scale on which the structures of the ancient world were built ; secondly, their geometrical design ; and thirdly, their essential similarity in both general form and in symbolism whether archaic American, ancient Egyptian, or old Indian. Humboldt was the first to remark upon this similarity, and it has since his time, been frequently pointed out.

Taken together, these three features suggest a common knowledge, and a common worship based upon a common astronomical principle, differing only in non-essentials and the nomenclature of its gods, owing to geographical and linguistic differences in different parts of the world. The Solar and Lunar worship in the two hemispheres was, in fact, the same in origin.

The construction of the great cities, pyramids, and temples in America was by no means haphazard ; it followed a definite geometrical design dictated by Astronomical observation, and in which the prevailing idea, according to Madame Blavatsky, is that of the Pythagorean sacred numerals. And, it is to be remembered, Pythagoras gained his knowledge in Egypt and India. Astronomy formed the basis of religion, of architectural plan, and of life. The system was therefore highly scientific and it, no doubt, symbolised the relationship of individuals, localities, and states or communities to the universe. Cities and villages themselves may well have been laid out, in their relationship to one another, on some astronomical plan. Such a supposition might account for the Maya's periodical desertion of their large cities, but more likely this was connected with superstition, and a belief that evil spirits had taken possession of them. Frequent human sacrifice in which the Maya indulged, might well give rise to some such belief.

If a paper, which appeared in the "Kansas City Review of Science and History" for November 1878, is to be relied upon, relics among which were gold and silver ornaments were discovered beneath the deposit of guano in the Guanapi Islands, estimated to have taken more than 500,000 years to form, if the rate of deposit before the conquest was uniform. It is curious too, that the Maya calendar should have embraced periods, the highest of which represents cycles of 8,000, and of 160,000 years respectively. At Copan, a six period date is recorded ; at Palenque one of seven periods recording a span of roughly 1,247,653 years ; and at Tikal an eight period date representing approximately the astounding sum of 5,000,000 years. If the latter figure represents the beginning of the world, that world must have represented America to the mind of primitive man. But were these people primitives, and was it the Maya who built these Central American cities ? It is generally assumed that the earliest inhabitants of America filtered through from Eastern Asia by way of the Behring Straits 10,000 or more years ago. It is permissible to presume, however, without giving undue credence to the tradition of a submerged continent, that the American and African coasts have been considerably modified during so long a period. A cursory glance at the map is sufficient to suggest the possibility of some point of contact between the two continents in the past, perhaps a passage no wider than the Behring Straits, easily navigable. For those with any practical experience of the force of water used for irrigation, of mountain floods, and river "crescientes," this supposition will require no stretch of imagination ; a narrow passage very easily becomes a wide one ; the theory of such a passage is not unreasonable ; the circumstantial evidence is for rather than against it. The pyramids in America have their prototypes in Egypt, and the temples their fascimilies in India. The terraced mounds of North America, square, hexagonal, octagonal, and truncated, are in all respects similar to the "teocallis" of Mexico and to the "Topes" of India, says Madame Blavatsky, who was

acquainted with both. The pyramids of Teotihuacan, the monoliths of Palenque and Copan, she notes are of the same character, as the temple of Tiahuanaco, which, were it in India, would be attributed to Shiva. But now the waters of Lake Titicaca have receded twelve miles from the ruins of the old temple, yet the earliest date recorded on a monolith at Uaxactun is, according to Spinden's correlation, 68 A.D. Coupled with this evidence, the discovery of the Tuxtla statuette bearing the date 100 B.C., leads Dr. Gann to assume that the Maya travelled South from the State of Vera Cruz to Uaxactun, Guatemala, taking 168 years to complete the journey of 400 miles, yet no traces of this migration exist. Surely such slender evidence is insufficient to substantiate this belief, but doubtless further research will be productive of new evidences. A. D. 68 may not have been the earliest date recorded at Uaxactun; we know that the Maya calendar, if the correlation is correct, is calculated from the year 3,373 B. C.; earlier monoliths may have existed; at Palenque, we know that this must have been the case. Dr. Gann, in fact, points out that early stelae were frequently broken up to provide material for those recording later periods. The hieroglyphics, too, used by the Maya at the time of the conquest, give no clue to the interpretation of those employed on the monoliths. Moreover 'maize' was the staple diet of the Maya, as of other primitive races. Where did it originate? If it was developed by intensive cultivation from the "teosinte," the only known plant with which it can be crossed, the gap, Dr. Gann observes, between "teosinte" and cultivated maize was an exceedingly wide one, comprising centuries of evolution. Is it not possible that this Indian corn originated in India and found its way to America via Africa, where it is also the staple Native food?

History of the Maya, although a little curtailed in its concluding chapters, is full of interest. It can be cordially recommended to readers requiring the latest information on archæological research in Central America.

L. E. PARKER

Selections from the Works of Su Tung-p'o. Translated by C.D. Le GROS Clark. (Jonathan Cape. London. 21*s.*)

Confucius and Confucianism. By RICHARD WILHELM. (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. London. 6*s.*)

Selections from the Work of Su Tung-p'o is a most welcome addition to our rather meagre translations from the Chinese poets. Mrs. Florence Ayscough, in her memorable *Tu Fu*, pointed out the great difficulty in translating Chinese poetry into English without sadly dimming the brightness of the original. There has been the literal, but uninspired, rendering: the exotic paraphrase, set to charming music: the crude jingle. None has been satisfactory, for each method has shown distortion. Mrs. Florence Ayscough and Mr. Arthur Waley have been as successful as the limitations of translation permit.

To these honoured names we must add that of Mr. C. D. Le Gros Clark, who has most happily translated some of the prose poems of Su Tung-p'o (A. D. 1036–1101), while Mrs. Le Gros Clark has embellished his efforts with charming wood engravings. Here are poems that reflect wisdom, a subtle humour, a deep love for the varied beauties of Nature. Su Tung-p'o was often in prison for having propounded opinions contrary to those in authority. On one occasion he was reduced to eating nothing more attractive than chrysanthemums. Like so many Chinese poets he was a wanderer, but unlike Tu Fu he did not rail against misfortune. He took what life had to give with both hands. It is the man's unfailing happiness, to which the wine cup may have contributed, that imparts to these poems a live and pleasing quality. Simple in theme—things seen and deeply felt—they are jewelled with classical allusions which

we may readily appreciate by turning to the valuable notes and commentaries. "Life in this world," said a friend to Su Tung-p'o, "is just bending and straightening the elbow." It meant a good deal more to this Chinese poet.

We must take exception to Mr. Le Gros Clark's use of the word "pen" on page 78. Although pens were in use in China, and even primitive fountain pens, long before they were known in other countries, we think brush, rather than pen, would be applicable to the Sung dynasty.

The greatest man in China was Confucius. From the time when he set forth his simple but practical teaching to the fall of the Chinese Monarchy he was the most important influence in that country. He was a Sage whose wisdom was of this world, and not another. It is recorded in the *Lun Yü* (Analects), which contains the sayings of Confucius: "While you do not know about life, how can you know about death?" He frequently referred to Heaven, but according to his great commentator, Chu Hsi, Heaven was not the abode of the blessed, as we understand it, but signified "Abstract Right". The nature of the Sage's scholarship, combined with a knowledge of life, his simple, incisive teaching, his almost total freedom from superstition, made it extremely unlikely that he cherished a secret belief in a future existence. If we may claim that he was an agnostic, we must also reveal the fact that "he devoted himself to the study of the esoteric teachings" of the *I Ching*. He read that work so much "that he three times wore out the leather thong which held the book together".

Dr. Richard Wilhelm's *Confucius and Confucianism* is the best book we have read on the subject. Written by one who was not only a great Chinese scholar but also one who identified himself with Confucian thought, it is a sympathetic and critical study of immense value. Dr. Wilhelm, aware that the Chinese, except in isolated cases, no longer follow Confucius, rather wistfully expresses the hope that a Confucian revival may be possible in future. Unfortunately Dr. Wilhelm died in March, 1930. Had he lived to-day, that hope would have been shattered, for what has been taking place in Manchuria of late is incompatible with the Golden Rule of Confucius. Perhaps he knew his teaching would not last beyond a certain period when he sighed and sang:

> The Sacred Mountain [Tai' Shan] caves in,
> The roof beam breaks,
> The Sage will vanish.

HADLAND DAVIS

An Adventure. By C. A. E. MOBERLY and E. F. JOURDAIN. A New Edition with Preface by Edith Olivier and a Note by J. W. Dunne. (Faber and Faber Ltd., London. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

In 1911 there was published for the first time an account of a very remarkable psychic adventure experienced at Versailles in 1901 by two ladies who wrote under the assumed names of Miss Morison and Miss Lamont. The book at once excited great interest and was thrice reprinted in the first year of its appearance. The identity of the writers was privately known to many people, and their story had been often narrated during the ten years which intervened between its occurrence and its publication. These years have witnessed the thorough investigation of many problems raised by the experience and the verification of numerous details the record of which made up the major part of the volume then issued. The present edition for the first time publicly reveals the identity of the writers whose status in the educational world and position as successive principals of St. Hugh's College, Oxford, gives added weight to the evidence, although the straightforward simplicity of the original recital carried conviction of truth to open-minded readers, puzzling though it might have been to explain the

"Adventure" to any one not acquainted with, or prejudiced against, the study of occultism. Briefly, in 1901 the two ladies visited the Petit Trianon in the ordinary course of sight-seeing at Versailles, and there became aware of persons, buildings, and other surroundings which have had no physical reality for something over a century. In fact they saw the beloved resort of Marie Antoinette as it was in her day and not as it is now. The present was blotted out and the past not only manifested itself to the sense of sight but also to that of hearing and touch, while—and here is the extra-ordinary part of the story—the percipients were in entire ignorance that they were experiencing other than the usual present day conditions, and unaware of anything abnormal save a sense of depression that they attributed to personal fatigue. When shortly afterwards they became aware of the abnormality of what they had experienced they entered upon a close investigation in a spirit of scientific inquiry, and with a sound common sense, even with inborn dislike to anything savouring of the mystic or abnormal. Later they tentatively adopted the theory that they might have telepathically entered into the memory of the unhappy Marie Antoinette on the anniversary of the terrible day when she was dragged with her husband and children before the National Assembly, and they imagined her conjuring up the picture of Trianon and events there during the long hours of waiting.

Twenty years later we read the narrative again with interest vividly enhanced by the preface contributed by Miss Olivier who not only had the advantage of hearing the story at first hand within a few months of its happening, but has recently had the complete series of evidential documents relating to it under review. These records are deposited in the Bodleian Library where they remain as a monument of patient research and single-minded devotion to truth. There, Miss Olivier tells us, we may "follow month by month, and sometimes even day by day, the slow tracking down of one piece of evidence after another, and can share the amazed delight of the searchers as detail after detail was verified." One feels a special pleasure in reading this vindication when one recalls the frigid reception of the original volume, so characteristic of the earlier files of the Proceedings of the S. P. R., and remembers the many sneering allusions to the two "adventurers" and their book which have cropped up from time to time in the press from persons who ought to have been better informed. Sir Wm. Barrett and Mr. Andrew Lang were among those who later recanted their original attitude, while Sir Oliver Lodge has on several occasions publicly testified to the genuineness of the record.

The present edition gives us some useful reproductions of contemporary maps and pictures, notably one of an original map by Mique which was only accidentally recovered from a long entombment in the chimney of an old house two years *after* the "adventure" at Versailles but it was found to justify an important detail of the *mise en scène* while, at the same time, providing evidence against the hypothesis of telepathy from some living person who might be suspected of knowing of its existence. To the student the favourite telepathic hypothesis of the S. P. R. needs not to be invoked: the "memory of Nature" is accepted as a reality and occasional involuntary contact with its records, though not exactly common, is not, as termed by Miss Olivier, a unique experience. The note by Mr. J. W. Dunne (the author of *An Experiment with Time*) discusses the "Adventure" in the light of the modern theory of serialism, arising out of Einstein's revolutionary theories of space, and the consequent relegation of time to the fourth dimension, but this, though suggestive, does not lead to a mind-satisfying conclusion. The adumbration of "Akashic Records" which Professor Balfour-Stewart and Tait published nearly sixty years ago on the basis of the scientific theories of their day, remains still suggestive of the physical mechanism of a universal picture gallery into which from time to time—wherefore we know not—adventurers may stumble like Miss Moberly and Miss Jourdain and return to startle their contemporaries. But few indeed of such adventurers have taken their experience in so rational and serious a spirit and, by patient inquiry, left on record such convincing proofs of its reality.

EDITH WARD

Creative Energy. By I. and L. E. MEARS (John Murray, London. 6s.)

There are more than 1,450 treatises, which attempt to elucidate the meaning of the nine diagrams of *Yih King*, listed in the Imperial Chinese Catalogue. This is not surprising; every author of such a treatise must and does provide an interpretation in accordance with his own relative understanding, his own pre-conceived ideas, and his own abstract theories. But we do not achieve by analysis, but by construction. The meaning of these diagrams is to be experienced rather than explained.

There is moreover a tendency among abstract writers to employ words and expressions, the meaning of which is by no means clearly defined. If there is an abstract science, then that science must be exact. The authors of this introductory volume to the science of the *Yih King* use the expression "fourth dimensional knowledge," defining it at one time as intuitional or sub-conscious knowledge, and at another, as spiritual knowledge. Intuitional knowledge may be thus numbered and bounded; may be more or less, and may be very frequently wrong and misleading; it refers to the temporary, to action or to inaction. True, spiritual, or cosmic knowledge must be free and all-inclusive; it cannot be numbered. Planes and spheres are more carefully defined. "'Planes' seem to imply superposition of one plane upon another: whereas 'spheres' of different density may be concentric and interpenetrative." This is sufficiently clear; we know at any rate the authors' meaning and can follow their interpretation of the philosophers' Grand Circle of sixty-four hexagrams.

Superficially the theory dealt with is not difficult to grasp. It is a cellular theory of creation. The creation is not yet finished, it is still taking place; each of the six days of creation marks a stage of development and progress towards the creation of man in the image and likeness of the Creator; that is man's end, not his beginning. The latter likeness is potential only; the powers have to be developed and unfolded by natural transmutation, or as Goethe so well puts it—

> And thou must needs in strength and stature grow
> According to the law that gave thee being
> So must thou be, naught other canst thou do
> The Sybils and the prophets have decreed it
> For time and space are powerless to break
> The form here stamped, which life doth but develop.

The *Yih King* is literally and figuratively an evolutionary pattern, which is being woven by cellular self-multiplication on precisely the principles of the cellular theory known to natural scientists. This theory was discovered by Matthias Schleiden in 1838, after experiments in plant life, and it was found afterwards to apply to all organic life and evolution of forms. Thought images, the *Yih King* shows us, follow the same law of unfoldment and growth.

It is impossible to conceive the idea of mind, not functioning, not incessantly creating in shape or form by thought. According to the theory contained in the *Yih King*, there are two opposing forces, Yang and Yin, which may be variously applied as positive and negative, light and darkness etc. Firstly there is universal mind with its dual Yang-yin or male-female aspect; that is to say there is mind with its positive attribute thought-energy, by means of which it conceives in form and proceeds to multiply automatically. Thus one divides and becomes two, two becomes four, four

becomes eight, and so on up to the number of 64 beyond which the system does not go, being intended possibly to deal only with our own planetary system. The hexagrams are obtained by adding together the yang-yin aspects in a diagram showing the cellular division. They are then placed around a circle in numerical order, each group of eight hexagrams, being symbolically named, while in the centre of the circle they are again represented in square formation. The authors interpret the meaning of the Grand Circle in a spiritual rather than a scientific sense, although the present writer is inclined to believe that there are mathematical correspondences based upon astronomical calculations, which would require knowledge we do not now possess to unravel.

In its simpler aspect, the Circle is intended to demonstrate the principle of unity in diversity. A thought or idea, for example, is dual, it can be argued from opposite standpoints. These two ideas give birth to four more, and so on until we have 64 ideas derived from the first, all correlative. Place these around a circle with their opposites on the other side of the circumference, and the original idea in the centre. Examine any one of these points of view by itself and it will give no clue to the central idea, and if we proceed to argue from it, we shall immediately be opposed by someone who believes its opposite to be correct. To arrive at the one truth which all these apparently conflicting views represent, it is therefore necessary to examine all in their relationship to one another, and then to work backwards to their central unity. The tortoise employed as a symbol of unity by the Chinese philosophers is an excellent one. The head and the tail, the fore and the hind legs are all opposites, but when its members are withdrawn by the tortoise, the idea of unity or collectedness is conveyed.

Dr. Isabella Mears is the well known translator of *Tao-Teh-King*; in the present volume which deals only with the first six diagrams of *Yi King* she is assisted by her daughter Miss L. E. Mears. The authors treat their subject with sympathy and understanding. The meaning of the complicated written Chinese characters are excellently interpreted for the reader.

L. E. PARKER

[*Yih King* called "the Kabbalah of China" was written, says H. P. Blavatsky "by generations of sages."—EDS.]

Miner. By F. C. BODEN. (J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., London. 6*s*.)

This little book presents us with a tragic study—the study of one who by circumstance and environment is obliged to earn his living as a coalminer, while Nature had endowed him with a sensitive imagination. The horrors of such a calling are clearly shown, and though the conditions have improved during the last thirty years, they are still sufficiently terrible to be a living nightmare for one like Danny, the subject of this study. There were compensations, of course,—a sympathetic and understanding home-life, the love of a devoted girl,—but once drawn into the death-in-life of the pit, the way of escape seemed impossible. So we leave our hero. Fortunately all men who work in mines are not made of such fine clay as he was, but that is no reason why so much suffering should still exist. Last century Mrs. Browning voiced "The Cry of the Children". Mr. Boden—surely from experience—voices the cry of the sensitive and imaginative in this century. He has given us a very human document.

T. L. C.

Common Sense and the Child. By ETHEL MANNIN (Jarrolds Ld., London)

Copies of Miss Ethel Mannin's *Common-Sense and the Child* are being sold by the thousand all over the world. The book is typical of the modern outlook on education. It is amazingly outspoken, which is as it should be. The training of our children is too precious to be the subject of hypocrisy and subterfuge. Only the old school of religious teacher will be shocked; and he or she must bow to the inevitable, accepting the fact that, in a few years, Victorian upbringing will be as obsolete as the handsome-cab. Behind the old system was a wealth of superstition, and endless relics of primitive tribal belief. All that is being swept away to make room for new ideas on psychology, hygiene, and science.

Quite rightly, education is profiting by the change. At the same time, a word of warning seems in point. A great many people will end by thinking like Miss Mannin—that is certain. Now is the time to warn them that, though she be right in many things, she has not said the last word. In setting out down the new road, something has been forgotten. If we are not careful, it will soon be too late to turn and fetch it. Yet that something is important, the most important thing of all—I mean, the "mystic sense," not to use the much-abused word *religion*.

Miss Mannin goes briefly and clearly into all the main branches of her subject. Her book is popular and cheap, and we may well take it as a typical specimen. She wastes no time in coming to the point about religion. A great deal of what she says about it is quite true, but where she fails, it is through ignorance. She imagines that the religion she sees about her in England is the only religion in the world. Not having the mystic sense, any more than most of our modern educators, she is not aware of its existence. She passes all mysticism with the eyes of a cat in a hayfield, which register only mice and miss the beauty of the flowers. Of the great religions of the East, she has probably never heard—certainly they have made no impression. Those who protest against the old system of education, based as it is on superstition, invariably fail to look further than the religious bodies round them. The first foundations are rotten; they attack and demolish, and begin to rebuild with no foundations at all. In that lies the reason for a serious lack in the otherwise fine edifice they might hope to raise. No doubt it is excellent that children be brought up without the old fear of God the "bogey man". No doubt it is a thousand times better that children should hear nothing of "God" at all, than be brought up to revere the Idol of the average parson, a veritable Moloch in time of war, a Baal in time of peace. No doubt it is monstrous that little children should have thrust upon them the vile doctrine of "original sin". As to baptism—to quote Miss Mannin, "the baptism of infants would be monstrous if it were not so ridiculous. Consider the absurdity of that tiny, helpless scrap of humanity being 'purified' before being received into Christ's church! When I have said this to mothers, they have said, 'Oh, well, after all it's only a ceremony; it doesn't mean anything.' But if it doesn't mean anything, why go through with the absurdity? The only possible excuse for anything so absurd, is a passionate belief in every word of it!"

However, "religion" can hardly be said to begin and end in England. There are other Gods than these. A few plain thoughts about an impersonal, universal God, whose face is seen in the beauty of Nature and the grandeur of the heavens, whose mind is seen in the perfect working of cause and effect, could only help the child. Such thoughts can be culled in the East in every field of religious endeavour. They would have the opposite effect to inspiring fear: they would form a background of solid faith in the darker moments both of infant and adult life. The trouble is that, lacking a knowledge of Eastern lore, Miss Mannin and her colleagues fall back upon the theories of

Freudian psycho-analysts for a keystone to their arch. But Freud stopped at the sub-conscious. He ignored the super-conscious altogether. So do they. Consequently their house is built upon sand. Did they but pierce through the sand and set the foundations in the rock, it would still stand firm. For the sub-conscious is filled with hereditary impulse, forgotten memories, individual complex and the like; but the super-conscious, with which the old mystery religions of the East bring us into contact, is the divine Self of man. Its power to control both the sub-conscious and the conscious is unlimited. It is that, that we must teach the child to reach.

The modern educator, putting aside God as at least suspect, nevertheless admits a strain of innate goodness. Judge Lindsey's famous book, *The Revolt of Modern Youth*, is filled with testimony to the existence and active working of fine and noble traits in a child's character if led by suggestion or example or simply "put on its honour" and not coerced. His thirty years in the Juvenile Court at Denver afforded him and the whole world ample proof that he was right. Miss Mannin agrees, and both of them are inclined to build up an ideal system on this basis. Had they, however, been less hasty in rejecting religion and gone to the East for the few genuine and entirely simple religious truths that underlie the best Eastern creeds, they would have been able, instead of rejecting, to make use of a powerful force, indispensable to the attainment of their aims. Then, realising that the innate goodness in the child *is* God, a sign of underlying Divinity, the only permanent Reality, they would see to it that education included the formation of a passage, properly tunnelled and carefully preserved, through the muddy waters of the sub-conscious to the pure spring within. That it is possible to do this, millions of child-lives in the East, over countless centuries, bear witness. A space of daily meditation is natural to children: there is nothing there of coercion or religious forcing. A few simple thoughts about the One Consciousness underlying the whole, are equally natural and easy to assimilate. Miss Mannin insists eternally upon the "natural"—she need have no fear, therefore, of the East. Indeed, it is *un*-natural to start from the premise that child-life is based primarily upon the sub-conscious, for it is not true. The sub-conscious does not provide all the innate leanings to goodness. They well up *through* it from the super-conscious. In early years the divine nature is strongest: the "trailing clouds of glory" still flood the child's being with their light. It is back only recently from its supernal home. Later, as the years go by, earthly life strengthens the lower tendencies in the sub-conscious, and the glory of the sunrise fades.

It is *natural*, then, to train the child to keep in touch with its super-conscious self. Three great dangers are bound, otherwise, to present themselves sooner or later, whether separately or together. In the first place, with the strengthening of the sub-conscious to which ready access is encouraged by the new school, there is a grave risk of falling back into the primitive animal outlook upon which it mainly thrives. A return to the pre-historic, not an evolution back to the Divine, must inevitably result. Then, circumstances are such that *all* children cannot be the happy, careless beings Miss Mannin desires, nor can trouble of some sort be avoided in this mortal life; and a human being in trouble, with nothing but his own sub-conscious to fall back on, is in a sad way indeed. Thirdly, with the expansion of study and consciousness, a child untaught in communion with the Self, is necessarily drawn into the apparent divergence between materialism and spirituality, mysticism and science, with disastrous and quite *un*-natural results.

For the rest, the ideas of Miss Mannin and her friends are sensible enough—they are eminently sound in matters of hygiene, food, clothes, elementary psychology, and sex. They err badly, however, in imagining that beauty, *qua* beauty, has no influence on the child-mind, and that beautiful surroundings are ineffective in instilling an aptitude for "culture". Even leaving on one side the super-conscious which *is* beauty but which they ignore, the sub-conscious is deeply affected by it, even if the outward consciousness is not.

A word might be added on sex, had these modern educators travelled in the East. Vague ideas of sublimation are hardly satisfactory to older children. The latter are perfectly well able to assimilate the outlines of some simple teaching on the creative power of the soul and its relation to sex, without dangerous incursions into the regions of the occult.

One is often tempted to recall the plaint of Swami Vivekananda, that religious people are for ever shouting, *Be good, be good!* but never stop to show us how.

As to discipline, it is likely that the modern educator, in his enthusiasm, will go to dangerous extremes. A child, trained to commune with the Universal Self, will have natural good manners. Will it acquire and keep them without that stimulus? It is to be doubted. At any rate, Miss Mannin might well remind herself, from time to time, of Milton's line:—

Licence they mean when they cry Liberty.

R. A. L. M. ARMSTRONG

Fragments of a Faith Forgotten. By G. R. S. MEAD. (J. M. Watkins, London. £ 1.)

Were there Gnostic schools in existence long before the advent of Christianity? Did these schools represent, not single systems, but the evolution of one eternal truth, appearing in different disguises in one civilization after another and guided throughout the ages by custodians of universal evolution?

Mr. Mead does not directly formulate these questions; he infers them. Nor is it possible for him to directly answer them, but he does the next best thing—he draws the student's attention tentatively to certain not unreasonable inferences. But, actually, Mr. Mead is chiefly concerned with the period of early Christendom, and he places before his readers for critical examination and comparison all those remains of Gnostic evidence which have escaped destruction. He has collected these with considerable labour over a number of years.

Alexandrian civilization, during the three centuries immediately preceding the Christian era, is compared by the author with the present conditions of modern thought and with the past three hundred years of European history. Mr. Mead notes much similarity in these conditions. He says, "We see at work, though on a smaller scale, ... the same breaking down of old views, the same unrest, the same spirit of scepticism." Certainly to any observant student of world history, these ever widening cycles or spirals of recurrent phenomena are sufficiently striking to call for consideration. Why the evolution of thought should not proceed directly or at any rate follow a zigzag course, it is difficult to understand; all we know is that phenomena cannot be calculated, that one thing does not follow on another as we should expect it to do; it always goes back to return at some later period out of the same confusion or into it.

Mr. Mead carries his supposition further. He suggests tentatively that not only the same phenomena appear, but that the same souls experience them. From this argument it would seem that these are cycles of personal and individual experience as well; that the entity experiences in time; that there are breaks and recurrences in the evolution of thought, because matter is perishable. To look at Mr. Mead's suggestion more comprehensively and from the spiritual standpoint—incarnations, the earth, countries, towns, and localities are not births and places, but groups of conditions of the Soul, milestones of evolutionary progress; what Emerson calls "facts". The ancient city of

Alexandria having served the purpose which conditioned her, lies in ruins; nothing of her past splendour remains. Is it necessary to regret her? Is the new city the same as the old? Should we reconstruct her? Could we?

That very literal re-birth, the "Renaissance" of arts and letters, was shortly to reincarnate the spirit of Greece. In England, William Pitt was one of the most striking examples of the influence of Greek rhetoric. His tutor said of Pitt that "he seemed not to learn, but only to remember," thus consciously or unconsciously voicing Socrates: "Can you doubt that all learning is but remembrance?" The spirit of this age was classically æsthetic, refinedly intellectual, and slightly intoxicated by a lofty idealism. The eloquence of speakers was directed to the refined sensibility of audiences, and an orator was frequently more concerned with the measure of his passages than with the value of his argument.

This example may appear superficial, but it demonstrates some of the weaknesses that Mr. Mead perceives in a culture toward the creation of which Greek intellectual activities were directed. Delight in the beautiful became an end in itself, the simple gratification of an appetite for beauty. Greek myths contained old metaphysical truths in delightfully conceived allegories. They lacked the unifying and permanent quality of the sacred legends of Egypt, which represented different aspects of a single path, diverse attributes of the one omnipresent and omniscient Deity, a complete system of attainment by initiation into these many and complicated mysteries. Nor was Greece to regain any appreciation of this deeper quality of Egyptian thought until she faced the East again to unite her culture with its older traditions in cosmopolitan Alexandria.

Mr. Mead finds it impossible to classify the Egyptian mythological conceptions. He points out, however, that the Trismegistic literature contains a number of distinctive doctrines of Gnostic Christianity, usually exclusively associated with the historic Christ, but which actually have been in existence for thousands of years in the direct Egyptian tradition. Some comparisons between the Egyptian mysteries and those contained in the Askew and Bruce codices quoted in Mr. Mead's concluding chapters could probably be made. We also find exactly the same idea underlying the allegory of the scattered limbs of dismembered Osiris, and that of four-armed Krishna, with his many heads, and diverse appearances. This conception of truth everywhere and in everything is expressed in the single word "Amen," which the Church still uses, and in the Sanscrit word "Aum". This seems to point to a further close relationship between Indian and ancient Egyptian religions. Unfortunately it is possible to interpret an allegory in a number of different ways; and this people will do according to the turn of their own minds, none of whom grasp the idea perhaps, that the author had in mind. To express an experience in allegory is not difficult; it may not be possible to express it otherwise. But my experience need not necessarily be your experience; most people's reactions are in some degree different. To some few the allegory will be intelligible; to more it will be only partially so; and to the majority it may appear sheer nonsense, or else convey a quite different impression.

There are always two kinds of people; the literal who look only to the surface of things, and those who read subtle meanings into simple statements. To the latter class Philo belonged. Mr. Mead quotes his "De Vita Contemplativa", as evidence of pre-Christian Gnostic communities. Surely this is a misnomer for this superficial treatise, an over-elaborate report somewhat tinged with superstition. Philo exhibits all the extreme tendencies of the idealist and suffers all its inevitable reactions—is torn by the opposites. Idealism and imagination are good servants, but bad masters. Later in the book Mr. Mead himself has to convict Philo of reading "high philosophical conceptions into the crude narratives of the myths of Israel"; of believing "that every name therein, contained a hidden meaning of the highest import".

Mr. Mead's summary of the Bruce Codex is the first which has appeared in English, and we need not enlarge upon the difficulties of this translation and the years of study and research these "Fragments" represent. They will be found of value to students both for purposes of comparison and reference, and also as subjects for reflection. They should likewise prove of interest to general readers. Thanks are also due to Mr. J. M. Watkins for undertaking the publication of this third and revised edition of a useful work.

L. E. PARKER

Does History Repeat Itself? By R. F. MCWILLIAMS. K. C. (J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., London. *2s 6d.*)

The belief in "cycles" or periodicity was held universally amongst the earliest Hindus and embodied in their oldest religious philosophy. Of late this theory is gaining more and more credence. Statistics reveal the periodical rise and fall of arts and sciences, the cycles of earthquakes, of epidemics, of revolutions, etc.

Mr. McWilliams shows that the history of the Napoleonic Wars and their sequel are "most comparable in effects to those of the late war". The "Idealism" furnished by Alexander I of Russia in his sincere desire of "establishing the rule of peace on earth and goodwill" anticipated the doctrines of President Wilson. Whilst Alexander I inaugurated the "Holy Alliance", the nations under the leadership of President Wilson "pledged to join a League of Nations". The first effect of the cessation of fighting in 1814 was a period of prosperity, followed by "dire distress" in 1816. The year 1819 was worse than ever. "Unemployment, the spectre of 1930, prevailed to an unbelievable extent in 1820." In England, nearly 1,000,000 adults out of a total population of 12,000,000 were dependent on the poor-rates. The years of 1822 and 1823 were years of marked improvement (as in 1926 and 1927), and in 1824, prosperity seemed to have been restored. In 1825, (as it did in 1929) there was a passion among people for unbridled speculation, with the result, that a crisis occurred in the early part of December. "What a striking parallel! Eleven years and a few months from peace to crash a century ago; eleven years almost to the day history repeats itself." (p. 22)

What about the future in the light of these parallels? The author adds "whether history repeats itself depends in my judgment on whether men permit it to repeat. Left to themselves, the forces that move men and nations will go on producing similar results, just as individuals will go on making the same mistakes if they do not deliberately set themselves to the correction of their conduct and ideas." (p. 38)

Unless the author and others who recognize the reality of the law of periodicity begin to study how cycles are caused, the knowledge will not yield much practical benefit. Theosophy looks upon cycles as facts and offers a complete exposition about them, for which H. P. Blavatsky's Secret Doctrine should be consulted.

L. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE REINCARNATION OF CITIES

Readers of THE ARYAN PATH may be interested in the latest confirmation, from America, of the interesting fact brought out in the December number —that of the building of successive cities on the same site.

Ruins of at least three ancient towns on top of each other are reported to have been discovered last summer in Eastern Arizona by Dr. F. H. H. Roberts, Jr., of the Smithsonian Institution of Washington, D. C.

Attention was attracted to the ruins of two great stone buildings on top of a low mesa, all that remained of a large settlement, and investigation showed that they were built on about fourteen feet of ruins and debris left by still earlier peoples, representing several distinct cultures.

HENRY STETSON FARRAD

New Orleans

THE REALITY OF OCCULT POWERS

In his very interesting review of *Isis Unveiled*, which appeared in your January issue, Mr. J. Middleton Murry refers to those "others to whom the works of Madame Blavatsky are as scriptures". May I point out that Theosophists regard no books as scriptures in the sense of being too sacred to be criticised. H. P. Blavatsky's works have to be weighed up and judged on their merits in precisely the same way as all other writings. There are good books, bad books, and books of every intermediate grade of value; but there are no books whatever which are sacrosanct and taboo.

Every Theosophist will welcome Mr. Murry's thoughtful and sincere appraisement of *Isis Unveiled*. We may not agree with all he says about it; but he is utterly right in trying to judge the work in the light of his own experience; to read it through his own eyes. Uncritical acceptance of even the noblest book is only a little less pernicious than indiscriminate rejection. To form a just estimate of a book, discrimination, sympathy, freedom from bias, and that mysterious equilibrating faculty which is called common-sense, are all necessary. We admire the writings of H. P. Blavatsky because we find so much truth in them; but we do not accept a thing as true because *she* said it.

There is one element in *Isis Unveiled* which Mr. Murry says makes no appeal to him whatever, and that is H. P. Blavatsky's "endeavour to convince the public of the reality of occult powers". "I have never," he says, "been able to take even a faint interest in occultism... The masters of East and West have equally been my guides. But they have been masters open to all: books you can buy for half-a-crown. I have never felt the need of any more secret doctrine; nor do I really believe that, if there is a more secret doctrine, it is a whit more truly spiritual than the doctrine open to all".

The subject thus introduced is a very important one, and Mr. Murry can, I think, be answered best by an attempt to explain briefly the point of view from which he differs.

Isis Unveiled was addressed to the world of 1877, when beliefs were crude and sharply defined. There were no half-crown editions of the spiritual classics in those days. Religion was almost entirely unspiritual, and, as Mr. Murry says, spiritualists were "rather more impervious than mechanical materialists to spiritual truth". In such circumstances, to gain the public ear for a spiritual message, it was necessary to tread hard on the public toes; and to insist on the reality of occult phenomena was a most effective way of doing this. H. P. Blavatsky's defence and explanation of such phenomena was a direct challenge to the pet beliefs of Christians, Materialists, and Spiritualists alike. With one bomb she blew up the defences of all their camps,

and brought the garrisons swarming out to repel her attack. If *Isis Unveiled* had been simply what Mr. Murry would like it to have been, would the public of 1877 have paid any heed to it at all ? I venture to think that it would have died stillborn. When H. P. Blavatsky had awakened public attention, she ceased to talk about occult phenomena, which her later books assume as true, but pass over as relatively unimportant.

The occult tradition comprises, not only the principles and rules of spiritual living, but also a vast body of information about man and the cosmos: it has its own sciences of psychology, physiology, metaphysics, astronomy, and so on. But why occult ? As regards the West, one answer to this question hits the eye: for many centuries to profess any belief not authorised by the Church was to invite the attentions of the Holy Inquisition. The dissenter from orthodox Christianity had to choose between secrecy and the stake. It was dangerous to discuss spiritual truths even when wrapped up in the language of Catholic theology, or disguised under the chemical symbolism of the alchemists. Be it noted, however, that as soon as conditions permitted it, much of the secret knowledge ceased to be occult.

In the East, the essential spiritual truth, which Mr. Murry so well summarises in the last paragraph on p. 61 of his article, has always been available to those who could grasp it; but even in the East much knowledge has been kept secret from the uninitiated for various reasons, among them being the indisputable fact that its publication might assist unscrupulous persons to acquire super-normal powers, which they would certainly misuse. Again, it is absolutely useless to publish knowledge which is far in advance of the cultural condition of the times. Do so, and people will either ignore it, or twist it into superstitious shapes.

Spiritual truth and the spiritual path are the all important things, as Mr. Murry asserts. The outline of essential truth can be stated in a paragraph, and quickly grasped. But to understand intellectually and to aspire are only the beginnings. Between aspiration and realisation is a very long and thorny path, for the traversing of which aspiration and good will are not sufficient equipment. Knowledge is also necessary. It is not as though we could, as it were, achieve nirvana at a leap. We have to start from the conditions in which we actually find ourselves—conditions created by our own past acts and thoughts—and work our way through and beyond them. We have to undertake the long and laborious task of conquering our own lower nature and bringing it completely under the control of the higher; and before we can conquer it, we must understand it. If, on the first dawn of spiritual aspiration, we could cut all our ties with the world to commune with the Absolute in a hermitage, how simple it would be; but it cannot be done. Every step of the way has to be trodden. When we enter the path, we have still to accomplish all the multifarious actions that come under the head of duty—to family, to neighbours, to fatherland, and to mankind in general. For the proper carrying out of these things, we need knowledge of various kinds; and as we progress spiritually, other conditions and other problems will arise—problems directly connected with the inner life. To solve them we shall need to understand the science of man's inner constitution, of the machinery which connects mind and body, and how mind and body may both be brought under the government of the spiritual nature. Such knowledge—now occult—might fitly be communicated to one who had achieved a large measure of self-discipline and self-conquest; and ways to acquire it will doubtless open to us when we are ripe for and need it.

London R. A. V. MORRIS

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"————————*ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."

HUDIBRAS.

Sir Herbert Samuel who is President of the British Institute of Philosophy assisted at the foundation meeting of the Institute in Manchester. It is a gratifying sign that the Institute is active and interested in the multiplication of its centres. As more people study and discuss philosophy, even of the speculative kind, the greater chance there is for the birth of that spirit of mental detachment so sorely and pressingly needed by our civilization. Prides and prejudices, not only individual but also national and racial, stand in the way of a clear perception of humanity's disease. Philosophy is a purifier and cleanses the mind of its twists, shortsightedness and illiberality. But more, philosophy enables the mind to withdraw from the emotional complexes from which no mortal and no race is free. The very perceiving of the nature of any problem becomes most difficult because of emotions; much more, its solution becomes impossible. The personal equation, in our own or our country's life, forms a smoke-screen preventing the real view of the problem, not to speak of our approach towards and of our grappling with it. Therefore it is all to the good that the Institute is making this effort, and we hope that the London headquarters will not fall behind Manchester in acting up to the advice of the President, *viz.*, to take up the study and consideration of propositions of ethical value so intimately related to the well-being of the layman.

———

Himself a front-rank politician, Sir Herbert Samuel contrasted politics and Westminster setting them against philosophy and wisdom. He said—"I look forward to the happy day when I shall be able to give more time and thought to philosophy and less to politics." This divorce of politics from philosophy is a grave detriment to modern progress. Without the aid of philosophy, politics, which aims at the amelioration of society, has proved worse than impotent. In absence of philosophical and ethical principles the science of politics, both in its legislative and administrative branches, has strayed into some ugly corners. Plato was a philosopher as well as a politician, and a return to his views and instructions is one of the prime and urgent necessities in the West. It must be, in the nature of things, a return to his values, those he gave to principles of social and spiritual well-being. It may not be quite practicable to apply the details of Plato's political creed to the international

world of the twentieth century, but the fundamentals and principles on which Plato erected his Republic of enlightened leaders and educated followers is not only a possibility, it is a necessity.

———

Turning to the other side, philosophical research, as pursued to-day, has little to offer to political reformers. Abstruse and speculative, it has lost touch with the ethical well-being of the people. That philosophy, at its foundation, is metaphysical and abstruse, is natural, but its serious drawback is to be barren of warmth and devoid of humanity. We cannot quote a better example of the true expression of philosophy than the *Bhagavad-Gita*. It is abstruse and highly metaphysical in its foundations—about Spirit, Matter and Self; but its application of those principles to life and conduct of laymen are downright and self-evident, and makes it almost a unique book. Krishna, the expounder, and Arjuna, the learner, discuss metaphysical abstract ideas for the purpose of definite application of those principles to the action immediately confronting them.

———

Then Sir Herbert Samuel quoted Professor Einstein who said that "science had advanced far more rapidly than morality," and that "until morality had caught up to science, our troubles would not be cured". H. P. Blavatsky said that some fifty years ago. If politics are divorced from philosophy, there is also a separation between science and philosophy. Science is getting over the mistake of confounding theology with philosophy, ritualism with religion, and in the West, churchianity with Christianity. The function of philosophy and of religion is the same as that of science—to universalize all knowledge and to unite all nations and races. The synthesising of philosophy, religion and science is the urgent step to be taken by modern educators, who, thereby, will also give soul to politics and to sociology. The fundamentals of ethics and those of metaphysics are identical; it is the high task of our philosophers to demonstrate the fact. If science reveals that laws of matter are uniform everywhere, philosophy must reveal that laws of morals govern everywhere, and then only religion, unsectarian and universal, will become the guiding principle of a united people. Such is the dream of Theosophy, not a mere fancy, for what has been, will once again be, and time was when Universal Religion energized the thoughts of the entire world.

———

If on the one hand a spokesman for philosophy like Sir Herbert Samuel claims that his goddess possesses the power to supplement and bless the labours of men of science, on the other, we find in the person of no less a scientist than Professor Sir J. Arthur Thomson a liberal-minded willingness to concede that claim. Review-

ing a recent publication in the columns of *John O'London's Weekly* for February 20th, he says:—

> Another caution to be borne in mind is that there is in everyday life no small amount of knowledge—and wise knowledge, too—which is not reached by scientific methods but is based on life-experience and feeling. In other words, scientific method is not the only right-of-way to that composite appreciation of reality which we call "the truth about a thing or a person". Finally, Science asks with magnificent persistence and ingenuity the questions: *What is this, in itself and in its parts? Whence came this? How does this work and continue in its being? and Whither does it tend or into what does it change?* But it never asks, nor, if true to itself, does it ever try to answer the question which may be called the deeper WHY? It is trans-scientific, though it may be legitimate to ask what is the meaning, or significance, or purpose of all this. That is a philosophical or religious question, and while the *interpretative* answers suggested must not be contradictory to the *descriptive* answers which Science gives to its *What, Whence, How, and Whither*, they belong to a different universe of discourse.

If science and philosophy check and supplement each other's work, and in doing so seek verification of their own views from the world of the great ancients, science would be compelled to penetrate her wide-spread fields to greater depths, and philosophy, instead of circling empty heights, would be forced to descend to earth where the layman dwells. Then, our civilization would soon come to possess rules of conduct rooted in universal principles. Then, the mechanist, the farmer, the clerk, the house-wife would intelligently follow the religion of true ethics, devoid of theological absurdities and ritualistic superstitions. Such ethics flowering on the tree of metaphysics would be a fresh reincarnation of the age-old Wisdom-Religion, binding homes and nations in happy enlightenment.

The well-known authoress Evelyn Sharp writes to *The Manchester Guardian* of February 5th as follows:

> There must be something wrong with civilisation if life can be simple only when it is an expensive luxury. If you try to live in a tent you are haled before the nearest magistrate, which results in anything but simplicity. If you live on goats' milk and weave your own clothing you upset the economic system of the world and set empires in a ferment. Yet, perhaps, that is the only way finally to establish a simple order of things—to lead the simple life in a complicated civilisation until you bring the latter down with a crash and force the world to start afresh.

ॐ

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light ! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. III MAY 1932 No. 5

THE MESSAGE OF ALL TIME

The scientist is more than any science, as the man of devotion is superior to any religion, and the philosopher more profound than any depths of thought. After the writer has uttered his appeal, after the reader has conned the printed folio, then each returns upon himself, like a spectator devoid of a spectacle, for the Soul of man is the end as it is the beginning of all effort and of all wisdom. The seed of spiritual awakening lies in the recognition that the least of men equally with the greatest holds in himself the mystery of all time ; that the Soul is the Perceiver, and never can he see but image or shadow of Self in any vision or in any field of perception.

But the Soul called man is creator as well as seer, and never shall he be other than housed or prisoned in his own creations. To imagine otherwise is to deny one's own inherent divinity, to be ignorant of one's own creative power ; is to spin a cocoon of self-immurement whose only escape is death and rebirth, instead of the conscious weaving of the vesture of immortality.

From the plane of the self-illumined Soul our science, our religion and our philosophy alike are but mirages, the phantasmagoria of human consciousness, whose only value is negative—to enforce the lesson that beyond all creation is the creator, beyond things seen and things done is the Seer. From any other perspective than that of the enduring Self man is engulfed in the blindness which does not see that neither in the unit nor in the assembly is any citadel of thought impregnable to assault from without, or permanently tenable to

the inhabiting Genius. For the seeing man in the dark is as blind as the sightless man in the light. At home within one's Self who can fail to glimpse, to grasp, to realize there is Something behind all science which must forever elude all analysis—the Indiscrete within and without all discrete objects? There is Something to which the prayer of the faithful does not reach; Something that our philosophy can neither explain nor adjust—something Infinite, to which our enclosures are non-existent. The sleeping Soul, the dreaming Soul, the waking Soul—one and the same Soul, but what a distinction of states, what a difference of realization.

It is this highway of Soul which is the Aryan Path, the *noble* path. It is travelled by all the Sages no less than by ourselves, but they travel it in full consciousness, albeit side by side with the dreamers and the sleepers. These latter the Sages no more disturb than the brooding mother the cradled babe, asleep, not in matter, but nestled within the two arms of love and knowledge. Who can doubt that love without knowledge is better than much learning without love? Mother-love has something of both. Without it, none of us had been born, none could survive. Even so, without the compassionate wisdom of the Sages none could be "born again," or survive in the world of Souls.

To the somnambulist Souls, called human beings, there come in their retired moments soundless echoes which blend with the breath of their own inmost longings. This is the Voice of the Silence, of Self communing with self, which the books call meditation. That voice speaks without distinction of race, creed, sex, party, or condition, and so can be heard only when the tumult and the shouting die in head and heart alike. Not till then can the human eye see, can the human ear hear, can the human mind learn, can the human heart feel, the spiritual influx of the Divine life within the carapace of selfhood. That influx is the seminal principle in all that lives—in the shine of the sun, in the air we breathe, in all the motions and emotions of the three worlds. Incarnation and reincarnation are the descent and the redescent of Souls from the formless unity of the all-pervading Spirit to the plains of space and time and action. The Sages make the journey consciously for the sake of all Souls; man, alas, makes the same journey as a dreamer voyages, "as idle as a painted ship upon a painted ocean".

The Message is the same however the sails are set, and in whatsoever wind that blows across the seven seas or rests amidst our doldrums. It is the same whether voiced by a Krishna, a Buddha, a Shankara or a Christ. Its meaning is the same within the savage heart or on Apollo's lyre, to him who listens as to him who speaks. But by the dreaming Soul, even of the saintliest it is heard only as the sigh of

one's own longing, the pulse within the chamber of one's own heart. It is the message of unity in the midst of diversity, of brotherhood in the midst of separateness, of the eternal verity within the mortal comprehension.

The Sages can only deal with the dreaming Soul called man as they find him. Why is this? No more than the physical embryo can come through fœtal stages to natural birth in mortal existence if interfered with, can the dreaming Soul come to natural birth into the spiritual life. No miracle of science, religion, or philosophy can turn the tender plant into the Tree of Life. One and all, our human helps are an interference with the own nature of the Soul, which is freedom, consciousness, and such knowledge as these induce. Self-knowledge is to be gained by preter-human means: "Self-knowledge is of loving deeds the child," and the highest human ideals are but dreams of brotherhood which, however they nourish the dreamer, come in fact from beyond the horizon of human self-interest.

To glimpse this is in fact to stir in one's sleep, is to see if but for an instant that Soul-knowledge is a transmission and not an acquisition—a transmission from the world divine to the human world. To see this is to assimilate something of the *being* of the Sages, as well as to realize the nature of the limitations necessarily imposed upon them when they descend from the sphere of their knowledge to our "sphere of expectations". If they would not violate the law of their own nature and of ours, the law of the Soul's *birth*-right, they must perforce "become in all things like one of us"—respect our dream properties and proprieties.

So never does the Sage seek to overwhelm our understanding however limited. He addresses us ever and always within the terms of our own devising; speaks to us of the dimensionless Soul within the formative limits of our senses, our sensations, our desires and aspirations. When he would have us kindle the sacred fire of the real Presence, he points out to us that no imaginable study of fuel will acquaint us with the nature of physical fire. His words are but a painted lamp to us until we catch the fire of his inspiration. So, when the Sages speak to us of the Real the dreamer of the noblest dreams sees at best but an image to be worshipped from afar off. So, we gauge the deathless, timeless, birthless Soul, by bodily wands and plummets. All the utterances of the *Achyuta*, the unfailing, are addressed to the *Chyuta*. We hear the words but, fallen Souls that we are, we think of our Estate and of theirs, and so do not hear the language of the Soul, but only that of the mind and emotions.

Yet here and there a dreamer rouses; quick or quickened by the divine impulsion to reach out for the union of all souls, he begins to question the reality of his own perceptions and conceptions, rather than those of other men.

These few are the "strivers for perfection" to whom the message of all time is in especial directed. They are the ones to be sought out, found, united in the bond of true fraternity, educated to the majesty of the eternal Wisdom-Religion, that they may be added to the chain of transmission called the Theosophical Movement. This chain stretches from the highest *Mahatma* to the humblest lover of his fellow-men. When this is seen, then the iron chain called Karma by the dreaming Souls turns to the pure gold of selfless action whose fruits feed all the creatures of the three worlds, but whose secret essence, the *prajna* of all experience, "makes of a man a God, creating him a Bodhisattwa, Son of the Dhyanis."

BUDDHAS OF CONFESSION

[**H. P. Blavatsky** writes in *The Secret Doctrine* (II. 423) as under. The extract should be read in conjunction with the article on p. 304.—EDS.]

"Thirty-five Buddhas of Confession," though called in the Northern Buddhist religion "Buddhas," may just as well be called Rishis, or Avatars, etc., as they are "Buddhas who have preceded Sakyamuni" only for the Northern followers of the ethics preached by Gautama. These great Mahatmas, or Buddhas, are a universal and common property: they are *historical* sages—at any rate, for all the Occultists who believe in such a hierarchy of Sages, the existence of which has been proved to them by the learned ones of the Fraternity. They are chosen from among some ninety-seven Buddhas in one group, and fifty-three in another,* mostly imaginary personages, who are really the personifications of the powers of first-named.† These "baskets" of the oldest writings on "palm leaves" are kept very secret. Each MS. has appended to it a short synopsis of the history of that sub-race to which the particular "Buddha-Lha" belonged. The one special MS. from which the fragments which follow are extracted, and then rendered into a more comprehensible language, is said to have been copied from stone tablets which belonged to a Buddha of the earliest day of the Fifth Race, who had witnessed the Deluge and the submersion of the chief continents of the Atlantean race. The day when much, if not all, or that which is given here from the archaic records, will be found correct, is not far distant. Then the modern symbologists will acquire the certitude that even Odin, or the god Woden, the highest god in the German and Scandinavian mythology, is one of these thirty-five Buddhas; one of the earliest, indeed, for the continent to which he and his race belonged, is also one of the earliest.

* Gautama Buddha, named Shakya Thŭb-pa, is the *twenty-seventh* of the last group, as most of these Buddhas belong to the *divine dynasties* which instructed mankind.

† Of these "Buddhas," or the "Enlightened," the far distant predecessors of Gautama the Buddha, and who represent, we are taught, once living men, great adepts and Saints, in whom the "Sons of Wisdom" had incarnated, and who were, therefore, so to speak, minor Avatars of the Celestial Beings—eleven only belong to the Atlantean race, and 24 to the Fifth race, from its beginnings. They are identical with the Tirtankaras of the Jainas.

THE PROBLEM OF THE 'MAN' AS BECOMING

[We welcome **Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids, M. A., D. Litt.,** the well-known Pali Scholar, the President of the Pali Text Society, and author of numerous volumes on Buddhism, among our contributors. It is an auspicious coincidence that her article reaches us just in time for this issue, for during the month of May the Buddhist world celebrates the Vaishakha festival which this year falls on the 20th.

In sending the article Mrs. Davids informs us that so far as she knows "the subject is new". She has presented an interesting thesis in so thorough a manner that not only the academician but also the ordinary educated reader will be able to enjoy it.

The object of the article?—" To show that the New Word, brought to his country by Gotama Sakyamuni, was not a reversal of that country's best religious teaching, but the effort to make it a living religion for every man and woman . . . . . His main work was in training a tender shoot of a wonderful plant so that following on the work of preparation done just before his time in India, it might 'become' what there was in it to become."—EDS.]

I

Yo Brahma veda, Brahma-iva bhavati
Who knows Brahma, becomes as Brahma.
—*Mund. Up.* III, ii, 9.

We shall never rightly understand what it was that Gotama Sakyamuni as founder of 'Buddhism' taught, unless we place him in his true framework: the religious teaching of the India of his day. We might as well try to understand Jesus' teaching aloof from all reference to the religious teaching in Palestine at the beginning of our era, or John Wesley's teaching apart from the Christianity of England in the eighteenth century. Great teachers have their setting in the historical tradition of their own countries; if they are founders of world-religions, they have a further setting, namely, in the history of the world as in process of religious 'becoming'. Our business is here and now with the former setting. And in a much overlooked episode in those priceless fragments of the Buddhist *Vinaya-Pitaka* of the Pali Canon, we come up against it.

We read that, in the second week after Gotama is said to have been 'enlightened' (lit. thoroughly awakened), and was at the 'Goat-herd's Banyan,' he was accosted by a brahman, belonging to a school or clan, of which the name has been oddly corrupted: the Huhunka-jāti. (Readings of the name vary, betraying half-forgotten records. It may have been Susukka-jati—a change of *s* to *h* we often see. This would give us Very-Bright-clan, a term we can parallel in Teutonic names).* After courteous greetings on both sides, the brahman asked these questions: "To what extent, master

* *Huhum* is in the Pali text assumed to be a snorting, disdainful habit !

Gotama, is one genuinely brahman, and what are the things that make a brahman?" The reply is much to the point, but it has been edited in verse (for memorizing) in terms that bear the mark of a stock scriptural saying, used elsewhere in the *Suttas*. It has ceased to be the reply we can hear one earnest inquirer stopping in his walk to make to another earnest inquirer.

A brahman—
He who has barred out* evil things, is not
A man of humph-and-pshaw, whose is no stain,
Who has the self controlled, in Vedas versed,
Who lives the Brahma-life, 'tis he may say
His is the Brahma-faith, for whom there are
No false excrescences in all the world.

Each speaker apparently goes his own way. The little fragment alone remains. For us it is of value. We can hear the corresponding modern question: "What man do you, Mr. So and so, judge to be a Christian indeed? Not just one who has been baptized, or who is an ordained priest."—or the exclamation: "Behold an Israelite indeed in whom is no guile!" The brahman as such was much like the Levite to other Israelites to this extent, that in virtue of his birth, religious duties were vested in him alone. His was it alone to learn and recite the Veda hymns; his alone to celebrate the ritual; his it was chiefly to be teacher of the sons of those who could afford to pay him, giving them many years of what we should now call a University education. He was honoured for this and he honoured himself. He was in that day the churchman in a very full sense. As teacher he had no full monopoly, for kshatriyas (nobles, rajas) could be teachers, as we read. In these and in the brahmans we see the world of culture of that day. It is not the world of the Many, but it was certainly a world of attention to the things most worth while. And we see Gotama, by this time well known (the Commentary reminds us of this) as a persistent earnest student, with brahmans and other nobles, of such worth-while things, consulted as one in sympathy with their inquiries.

The question indicates too, that within as well as without this church-cultured world, among brahmans, as well as among the new Jaina body for instance, there was going on an active religious interest, a quest for the real, the sincere, as more worth while than a world of codes and rites and habits of a formalized religion, a feeling after the better as something New, as a something More than established religion was giving them.

As these inquiries gained force, shortcomings in the established church, especially, it is said, in the North East rather than in the North West of India, would tend to be shown up. In the later Pitaka books we find strictures on brahman morals emerging. And this tendency has found its way into the episode with which I began, the work probably of later editors. It is in fact, in the telling, made so absurd, so unlikely in its absurdity, that it is easy to

* There is here a usual (and bad) pun :—*brāhma*—bāh.

read between the lines and see beneath the serious lofty inquiry which is met by a serious lofty, and also courteous response. It gives us a fleeting glimpse of what was afoot at the time and is akin to much else that emerges in Upanishad and Pitaka: a new interest both in practical religion and in things of the unseen, both during and after earth-life, an interest in "dhyana," or study in psychic access to the unseen, a new interest in causation as a mental procedure, a new interest in mind as distinguishable from the man.

I do not think we may look to find any world-religion launched without a preparatory responsiveness of this kind being astir among men just then and there, shortly before the birth of it takes place. Its world is getting ready for it. It is not easy for us, to whose world no recent gospel-mandate of any proven power to grow, to sway men, to persist, has come and who have very fragmentary records of the days when such a mandate was come, to put ourselves in such a world as that. Even were there no such fragments, some explanation of the little episode would be needed. As it is we seem to see this:—the message that was just coming made a singular appeal, the appeal of a supply to a demand, the response to something waited for.

It will not be in one way only in which the New Word will be felt as wanted. There is for instance this way—one that we have read of in this and that religious reform *within* a faith, and not as belonging to the birth of a mainly new gospel alone:—this is the felt need of a more vital and sincere life-expression of the faith professed. It is the appeal for 'works' to make real the faith, since a man only believes what he will live for, and if need be, die for. This is what we saw in the brahman's question. And this is what we seem to find is *not stressed in the Upanishads*.

Another way will be the need of a something *more* in the faith itself, around which questions are arising. This may prove to have been something which has already pre-occupied the cultured serious few, but to be only just emerging as a felt want among the Many. We have only to look into the fine ethical teaching of the Stoics before Jesus began his mission. And it may be that, while it is emerging for the Many through some Helpers of Men, it may have meanwhile been falling away among the Few. This may be, because the right, or 'die-hard' wing of the established religion has suppressed the more progressive movement in its fold. Or it may be, owing to a faltering in that movement itself: some ardent teacher has aged, or has died; some ardent but perverse junior has diverted the movement, brought in a way of the worse. But that progressive movement will have been taught to many young men, and so have been filtering out to find Everyman to some extent more or less ready for it. Now Everyman is a

practical fellow and will need something he can grip. The movement may need expanding, clarifying for him. But above all it may need to be made practical, part of his life.

This is how I see the progressive movement among the brahmans just preceding the birth of 'Buddhism,' as followed up by that which I see as its expansion, its stressing in the first 'Sakyan' mandate. It is shown, for me, in the increasing way in which the 'man' was being regarded less as a static being, more as a being in process of becoming other, different, *more*. I could easily show what I mean, if translators of the Upanishads had not so often, with one mainly consistent exception, slurred over this striking feature. Much depends on your considering this carefully, if you would find anything of weight in what is here set down.

Translators and readers, whether of text or translation, have overlooked this new feature about man's nature, mainly on one of three grounds. Firstly, they, we all, are the children of the Darwinian epoch. Consciously or unconsciously, we look at things from the standpoint of evolution to a degree unknown before. Not because we see men as changing only; there was nothing new in that. But the way in which we envisage change in man has become less of a mechanical, arithmetical change, more of a biological, more of a psychological change. We are more concerned with change as a matter, not of quantities, but of values, of quality. Again, there is nothing new about this standpoint in the scope of our religions. Its newness lies in its present all-inclusiveness in our culture. Hence that an old-world literature is to be found putting this standpoint to the front may escape the notice of the modern translator, just because he sees nothing strange in it.

But here that alone would not suffice. It may be that grammatically the translator does not see, in the way of expressing this "process of becoming other," as much as I see in it. And here, as unversed in Vedic (old Sanskrit) literature, I am at a disadvantage. For him this verbal root *bhū*, 'become,' with its derivatives, may be merely a help to the other verbal root *ās*, 'to be,' the future form *bhavishyati*, being the same for both. We see this in German also, with its *sein* to be, *werden*, to become, where *wird* can mean "becomes," or just "will be". Hence one may, especially if he be German, find it equally right to translate, say, *bhavati* by "is," or by "becomes".

Thirdly, the translator may not be disinterested about the matter. He may see unwisdom in rendering the *bhū*-forms by "become"-forms, because he both knows that the progressive movement, in brahman teaching, to see the very man (not body or mind) as in process of change was eventually quashed, and holds it was well it was quashed. Hence he will tend to render *bhū*-forms by many make-shift terms, or by *be*-forms.

Whatever the reason, it is certain that (*a*) a greatly increased use of *bhū*-forms, as compared with that in earlier literature, can be statistically shown; (*b*) this increase must be seen in the text, not the translations, to be realized. The one quasi-exception is Dr. R. E. Hume's *Thirteen Principal Upanishads*, where you can make the comparison by noting his "becomes" with the "is, are" or other words in, say, Max Müller's or Deussen's translations. Even he at times evades the 'become,' not always, I venture to think, with sufficient reason.

I would not be presumptuous here, who am off my special range, by claiming that the *bhū*-contexts always indicate the full force of 'becoming' as more or other than 'being'. Obviously, where the future tense is used, the meaning may be either 'will become' in the way of growth, or just 'will happen'; just as you might say in German "es wurde Nacht" for "night fell," or came on. Or, as in the Upanishad passage: "the wood of the fig-tree *bhavati* fourfold" – is split into four". Here is 'happening' apart from a matter of 'a becoming more' or 'expanding'. There is again the oft-repeated *tad api eṣo śloko bhavati*, which is usually rendered: "As to that there is this verse: . . ." and the speaker is inferred to have been quoting. As to this, the Pali idiom shows he may have been improvizing, wishing to make an impressive point, and feeling verse-creating afflatus. Then does the *bhavati* appear as the stronger form, he wanting to say "it comes over me";—a very genuine 'becoming'.

But when we have deducted all cases leaving room for doubt, far more than enough are left to show a new feature in Indian literature in this increase of *bhū*-forms. There will have been a reason for it just then and there, and it should be accounted for, as having stood for something new, something calling for expression, which had not been there before as so calling. If the word needed for that self-expression is there, it will be used; if it is not, make-shifts will be used. And because these will not be adequate, the ideas expressed by them will tend to get overlooked or misunderstood. Now the word needed was there, a much better word than any we have now left ourselves, we who in our old literature could speak of *wairthan weorthan*. Thus in our East Midland dialect:

> Falled in dad welle-grund,
> der he wurded heil and sund,
> and cumed ut al newe.*

I would not belittle unnecessarily our 'become'; it is we who have suffered it to become ambiguous, perhaps at a period when we were not enough needing expression of growth. I am only saying, that the word needed then in India was there and, in taking to use it more than before, some new need of it was being felt.

* *A Bestiary*, 12th or 13th Century.

Let us take a few instances. In the old *Taittirīya Upanishad* is a little homily to the student: *mātṛdevo bhava pitṛdevo bhava*, etc. Here it is possible to translate: "Be one to whom mother is a god . . .to whom father is a god" and so for teacher and guest. Dr. Hume is here content with "Be one. . . ." But surely the teacher is seeking to make his pupil a better man, *a more* than he is; surely here is where " Become a mother-god-man" is a truer expression of what he is trying to bring about. Here the two verbs were there, be, become: *edhi bhava*, but only the latter is chosen. And here again, just previously, it is the teacher asking for himself: *amṛtasya deva dhāraṇi bhūyāsam*: "May I, O God, become bearer of the immortal!" This time it is Deussen, who, as a German, had a word as strong as the Indian, and yet who renders this by: "May I be: moge ich Trager sein des Unsterblichen!" Surely he would have admitted that prayer is a reaching out to the divine will, willing to become *a more* than one just is! What a waste of a good word ready to hand! Or take this well-known passage on the dissolution at death of the bodily and mental complex: *kvāyaṃ tadā puruṣo bhavati*? "Where then becomes the man?" or, comes the man to be? In other words, where thereafter does the coming (the very life of the very 'man') go on? Deussen makes the feeble rendering: "Wo bleibt dann der Mensch?" (Where remains the man?), losing all the force in the question. But his was the case of a man who *wished*, in the interest as he saw it of Indian religion or philosophy, to evade the use of *werden*. This is patent in his annotations. One more instance: in the *Brihad-aranyaka Upanishad*, a man while in deep sleep, free, as being *himself* not body, to depart (in his other body) and enter other conditions, is thus described: "Then a father becomes not father, mother not mother," and so on for a number of relations which, for the brief interval, become invalid. Here again one would think that the *bhū*-form here were fitter rendered, as I have done, by a 'become'-form. Yet Max Müller's choice is, not 'become,' but 'is'.

The latent significance in *bhū*-forms becomes most impressive when we meet with what grammarians call the causative form. We have not, alas! this useful inflection. Sometimes we don't want it; 'place' is good for 'make stand'; 'drive', 'push', 'impel' serve for 'make go'. When we would have any one do, make, build etc. for us, our weakness becomes patent. Now the causative of *bhū*, which came to play so great a part in Buddhist diction, is very rare in the Upanishads, and so has it impressed translators that they have gone about to bring in such terms as "nourish" and "comfort" for " make—become!" Thus in the *Aitareyya Upanishad*, the pregnant mother must be 'nourished,' when the original has *sā bhāvayitrī bhāvayitavyā bhavati*: " the maker-to-become becomes one-who-is-to-be-made-become,—

as if the poet-teacher were playing with the pious idea of warding the wardress of man. Again, in the *Bhagavad-Gita* (III, 11): "Herewith make the devas become, and let them make thee become!" Dr. Barnett has translated with "Comfort ye the gods, and let the gods comfort you!" Against this, the choice of a very learned and poetically feeling master I am rash when I say, that "comfort" is but a secondary meaning of the causative *bhāv-*, and that it is possible we of the west have not sought to do justice to the literal first intention of the word. To make amends herein, let us picture more closely what "gods" had come to mean when the *Bhagavad-Gita* was taking its present, or next to present shape. We have to picture not a Vedic, scarcely even an Olympian background of 'gods' whom the sacrifice was to "comfort". We are coming to a world of brave and pious and splendid gentlemen, who are no more immune from the *samsāra* the wayfaring of lives and worlds than man himself, nay, who are themselves very man. We see them as such warding man, and also being spiritually warded by elect men, in a mutual furthering of progress in that long wayfaring. If only we could in English express 'become' causatively with aesthetic effect, as could the Indian, we should not need to go afield for such a word as 'comfort'. The mutual 'making-to-become' making to grow, building up is truer, more direct, more impressive. You would get my meaning if only your, our age would wake up to discern the very 'man' who is not just mind, but who is just as capable of his 'coming-to-be' as is the earthly mind with its much shorter-lived growth.

Well, we cannot all of us check our translators' choosings, nor presume to correct. But it is hardly to be wondered at, that we outside readers have failed to see as yet, in the increased use of these *bhū*-forms, something that was pressing for utterance, pressing between the years B. C. 600 to 500. Can we now light upon that 'something' in the world of religious ideas and aspirations?

I surely think we can; thus:—

C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS

[In the above article, the second instalment of which will appear in our next issue, Mrs. Rhys Davids shows the historical back-ground of the teachings of Gotama, the Buddha. There is another type of back-ground to which the following article of Prof. Bhagvat makes pointed reference. A conjoint study of the two articles is recommended.—EDS.]

THE LINE OF BUDDHAS

[**N. K. Bhagvat, M. A.**, Fellow of the Bombay University and a Professor of Sanskrit and Pāli, who was invited by Patna University to lecture on the *Abhidhamma* in 1924–25, is a popular expounder of Buddhistic lore on the platform and in the press. He is not only a Buddhist scholar but also a Buddhist by belief. His article brings to mind the words of H. P. Blavatsky that there existed an Elder Buddhism, which ante-dated the Vedic Ages. We print an extract on the subject on p. 296.—EDS.]

In Pāli Literature the doctrine of Dhammatā or the Law of unvarying operation under the existence of well-defined conditions has played such prominent part that even the doctrine of *Buddhattā* or Buddhahood has been reduced to a mechanical formula. In reducing things spiritual to the exactitude and accuracy of a mathematical Law, Buddhism tried to give equal opportunity to all, irrespective of any ulterior considerations of caste, colour or race, inferiority or superiority. Thus the Buddha was not like a Prophet, standing supremely high, unapproachable by none except the most fortunate, but one, who represented the culminating point in the all-sided development and perfection of humanity. Any one, who fulfilled those conditions, leading to full-enlightenment (Bodhikārakadhammās), was entitled to attain to that most exalted position of Buddhahood. Thus in Buddhism not less than twenty-seven Buddhas, beside the Bhagavāna Gotama are mentioned. It was in fact a Line of the Buddhas to which Gotama belonged, and in this article an attempt is made to give an idea of the names and a few details about these Buddhas.

Gotama himself has made a pointed reference to this race of the Buddhas in the *Nidāna Kathā*,* the story of the Nidānās (Epochs). This work is written by the celebrated commentator Buddhaghosa as an introduction to the *Jātakaaṭṭha-Kathā* or the commentary on the Jātakam. In this book Gotama is mentioned as visiting Kapilavatthu after his attainment, in the course of fulfilling his mission of spiritual regeneration. While passing through the streets of Kapilavatthu a-begging, he was seen by the servants of his father King Suddhodana; this news was too much for the latter to bear, and so he approached Gotama, and said:

"Sir, why do you put us to shame? Why do you go on a-begging? Is it not possible to get food to so many Bhikkhus?"

"This, Mahārāja," says Gotama, "is the custom of our Race!"

"I say, Sir, we belong to the illustrious Kshatriya race, and therein not even a single Kshatriya has maintained himself by begging his food!"

"This, Mahārāja, is your Royal line, but mine is *the line of the Buddhas*, beginning from Dīpankara down to Kassapa. These and other several thousands of Buddhas lived a life of Mendicancy!"* In this episode a distinct reference is made to the Buddhas. In the same work a detailed account of the twenty-four Buddhas, with only a passing reference to three Buddhas, before Dīpankara, is given in prose.† In another Pāli work, entitled the *Buddhavaṁsa*, the history of the Buddhas from Dīpankara down to Gotama is narrated in verse form.‡ In the *Nikāyas* proper or Collections of the Suttas, stray references to some of them are found. In the *Dīgha Nikāya*§ for example, mention is made and details are given of the last six Buddhas, *viz.*, from Vipassi to Kassapa.

In the *Majjhima Nikāya*, references to Kakusandha and his disciple Sañjīva are made; but nowhere detailed and exhaustive accounts of these Buddhas are given excepting in the *Buddhavaṁsa* and the *Nidāna Kathā*. It is with the help of these two works, that belong to a Nikāya of Miscellaneous Works (*Khuddaka*) that the following information is presented.

Here is a list of the names of these Buddhas:

तण्हंकर, मेधंकर, सरणंकर, दीपंकर, कोण्डञ्ञ (कौंडिण्य), मंगल, सुमन, रेवत, सोभित, अनोमदस्सि, पदुम, नारद, पदुमुत्तर, सुमेध, सुजात, पियदस्सि, अत्थदस्सि, धम्मदस्सि, सिद्धत्थ, तिस्स, फुस्स, विपस्सि, सिखि, वेस्सभू, ककुसन्ध, कोणागमन, कस्सप.

Taṇhankara, Medhankara, Saraṇankara, Dīpankara, Koṇdañña (sk. Koundiṇya), Mangala, Sumana, Revata, Sobhita, Anomadassi, Paduma, Nārada, Padumuttara, Sumedha, Sujāta, Piyadassi, Atthadassi, Dhammadassi, Siddhattha, Tissa, Phussa, Vipassi, Sikhi, Vessabhu, Kakusandha, Koṇāgamana, Kassapa.§

In this list, there is no detailed mention of the first three, since Gotama got recognition as a Future Buddha (Bodhisattva) from Dīpankara Buddha, and the three had preceded Dīpankara. Our Future Buddha in his passage of time through four immensities and a hundred thousand world-cycles to the present time had expressed his wish for Buddhahood under twenty-four of these Buddhas. The following details are given with reference to these Buddhas: the name of the Buddha; his assemblies; the caste to which he belonged (not necessarily given in respect of each); the capital, to which he first belonged; the name of his father; that of his mother; his two chief male disciples (*aggasāvakas*), his personal attendant Bhikkhu (*Upatthāka*); his two chief female disciples (*aggasāvikas*); the tree, under which he attained Buddhahood; the height of his body and lastly, the period of his life. For example, take Dīpankara Buddha himself: He had *three* assemblies: The first consisting of 100,000 koṭis; the second of 100 koṭis; and the third

* *Nidāna Kathā*, Devanāgarī Edition, by D. Kosambi, 1915.

* Vide: *Nidāna Kathā*, Section 150.
† *Ibid*: Sections 39–71.
‡ P. T. S. Edition, Ed. Morris, 1882.
§ *Mahāpadāna Sutta*.
§ Vide: *Nidāna Kathā*, Section 71.

of 90,000 koṭis. He belonged to the Warrior Caste (*Khattiya*). His capital was named Rammavatī. His father's name was Sudeva, and mother's Sumedhā. His two chief male disciples were Sumangala and Tissa. His personal attendant (Bhikkhu) was Sāgata. His two chief female disciples were Nandā and Sunandā. The Bodhi tree, under which he attained Buddhahood was Pipphalī. His height was eighty spans (*hattha*) and his length of life was 100,000 years!

In this wise, details are given of the remaining Buddhas. It would be profitless to give these in a tabular form. We shall try, however, to give certain peculiarities in respect of each item of detail, connected with a few of these Buddhas. Turning to the *Assemblies* of Bhikkhus or Shrāvakas, we discover fabulous figures of Koṭis or 100,000 and almost in a majority of cases there are mentioned three assemblies. In the case of Kakusandha, Koṇāgamana and Kassapa, however, there is stated only *one* assembly, as belonging to *each*: 40,000, 30,000 20,000 respectively. To a critical mind, these figures certainly would sound extravagant. Looking next to the *caste*, to which these several Buddhas belonged, we find therein mention made of the Brāhmana and the Warrior castes only. The Vaishya and the Shūdra castes seem not to have produced Buddhas! Koṇāgamana and Kassapa, for instance belonged to the Brāhmaṇa caste; Tissa, Vipassi, Sumana and others were Khattiyas. As regards the *Cities*, familiar names like Kāsī and Barāṇasī are there; but others like Uttara, Khema, Sudhaññvatī, Candravatī, Hansāvatī, Bandhumatī or Sobhavatī, are romantic and not traceable on our map.

In the list of names of the *Fathers*—Sunanda, Uttara, Sudhamma, Sudatta, Ananda, Sumedha, Jayasena, Sudinna, Aggidatta, Yaññadatta, Brahmadatta, are met with; while among the *Mothers*, names like Sujātā, Sirimā, Vipulā, Anomā, Asamā, Candā, Sudassanā, Visākhā, Pabhāvatī, Dhanavatī are noticeable. Among *two male disciples of each Buddha*, pairs like, Bhadda and Sunanda, Varuṇa and Brahmadeva, Sāla and Upasāla, Soṇa and Uttara, Sambala and Vasumitta, Tissa and Bhāradwāja are mentioned. The names of Varuṇa, Brahmadeva, Sambala, and Bhāradwāja deserve attention. An *Upaṭṭhāka or personal* attendant Bhikkhu is an important office, since the Bhikkhu had always to be near the Master. In a list of these, names like Pālita, Udena, Sambhava, Varuṇa, Vāseṭṭha Khemankara, Asoka, Sabbamitta, are met with. Among the names of the *two female chief disciples*, pairs like Sīvalī and Asokā, Soṇā and Upasoṇā, Sundarī and Sumanā, Rāmā and Surāmā, Dhammā and Sudhammā, Calā and Acalā, Subhadda and Uttarā are striking. The very fact that, like male disciples, Buddhism confers the distinction of being the chief on *female disciples* also proves that the equality of sexes had been fully accepted.

In the list of *Trees*, that have received the honour of being *Bodhi-trees*, (knowledge-giving Trees), Sāla, Nāga, Ajjuna (Arjuna), Mahānīpa, Piyaṇgu, Campaka, Āmalaka, Pāṭalī, Nigrodha, Assattha (Aswastha), Udumbara, Sīrīsa, and Kaṇikāra, are noticeable. As in all ages, trees have been held in high reverence, some of these names may throw light on the beliefs of the people of India in times past. As regards the *height* of these Buddhas, and their longevity, the figures look incredible. The *height* varying between 80 and 20 spans (*hattha*) and the length of life between 100,000 and 20,000 years! With this longevity, how can one complain of the shortness and impermanence of life?

Such are a few of the details of that *Vaṁsa* or the line of the Buddhas, to which Gotama belonged. These Buddhas begged their food, and in this life of mendicancy, they carried on the work of regeneration and moral progress. Buddhas represent the perfection of Personality, *par excellence*, and we have attempted to show that in this eternal march of time many Buddhas or supremely perfected Personalities must have existed and worked for the betterment of living creation.

The student of Comparative Religions will find herein much food for thought, as behind the appearance of these extravagant and astonishing details, there lies this grand truth—that greatness, unalloyed self-sacrifice, wonderful sincerity of purpose, untiring zeal for their mission and all-embracing love and compassion characterise these mighty Personalities of hoary antiquity. It is the liberal and catholic mind alone that will be able to see these essentials, after sifting them from the mass of non-essentials. It is in order to teach humanity to distinguish the essentials from the non-essentials, that these Buddhas appear in this World; it is the absence of such knowledge, that brings in its train all the ills of life. The Buddhas appear and disappear to the ordinary vision, but their infinite knowledge continues to exist and help all men according to the unfailing operation of the Law of Karma.

N. K. BHAGVAT

FREE WILL AND MODERN PSYCHOLOGY

[**Prof. C. E. M. Joad** examines the position assigned to Will by modern psychology in the light of Plato and Schopenhauer, who were greatly influenced by eastern wisdom. Professor G. R. Malkani, head of the Indian Institute of Philosophy has promised to present the Indian view of the subject next month.—EDS.]

The teaching of most modern psychology is—it is common knowledge—inimical to the freedom of the will. The threat to freedom comes from two quarters. On the one hand, psycho-analysis exhibits the dependence of all conscious faculties, including the conscious will, upon trends in the unconscious. Consciousness is seen to be a mere cork tossing on the unconscious waves of impulse and desire, and the faculties upon which we most pride ourselves, which we regard, in fact as the differentiating characteristics of our species, reason and will, are represented as servants of fundamentally irrational and uncontrollable elements in our nature, reason inventing grounds for thinking that what we instinctively wish to believe is true, and, will, duping us into the belief that what we instinctivly want to do is right. On the other, the new physiological psychology exhibits all mental occurrences as the functions of bodily occurrences. I think and will as I do because my body behaves as it does. Increasing knowledge of the part played by the ductless glands in determining character, coupled with the work of Pavlov on conditioned reflexes, has considerably strengthened this mode of interpretation, with the result that Behaviourism is probably the strongest single movement in psychology to-day.

In these circumstances it seems appropriate to indicate some of the grounds upon which the position of those who believe in free will rests. The freedom of the will can, of course, be advocated and has in fact been advocated from many standpoints. Of these one of the most important is that adopted in Hindu philosophy. I am not myself competent to expound the contribution which Indian thought has made to the problem, but it happens to be the case that on this issue, more, perhaps, than on any other, the thought of the East has affected the views of Western philosophers.

I propose, therefore, in the first place to illustrate this traditional conception of freedom, the conception of Hindu philosophy, from the work of two philosophers of the West, Plato and Schopenhauer. Secondly, to indicate what in the light of modern philosophy may be regarded as the minimum assumptions which are required for the freedom of the will.

I

Plato's doctrine will be found in the celebrated myth of Er, at the end of the tenth book of the

Republic. The myth of Er is a vision of the soul's fate after death. Er is taken to a spot to which the souls proceed immediately after death to be judged. There are two streams of souls, the first travelling to heaven or hell for a thousand years of bliss or punishment according to their deserts, the second returning after their sojourn in heaven or hell to choose a new life on earth. The choice which the souls make is the all-important crisis in their history. Into it there enter two factors, one of necessity, the second, that of freedom. In the first place, the order in which the souls choose is determined for them by lot; herein is the element of chance. But, secondly, however late in the order a soul gets its choice, it still has a choice, so that even the soul that chooses last, when all the best available lives might be considered to have already been snapped up, may still, provided it chooses wisely, obtain a life worth having. Once the soul has made its choice of life, it has chosen its destiny; thus a man's own will becomes his destiny in the sense that he can never reverse what he has once chosen or the consequences of his choice. Moreover, in making his choice his will is influenced although never determined by his past life and past choices. For example, souls who have spent a thousand years in Purgatory generally return the wiser for what they have undergone, so that they choose a humble life of wisdom and good works rather than a life of glory and power. Conversely the enjoyment of a thousand years of bliss sometimes leads a soul to make a worse choice than it otherwise would have done. In another dialogue the Phaedrus we are told that, if a soul after the enjoyment of bliss makes a wise choice and continues to do so on successive occasions, living better in each life and becoming better through repeated sojourns in heaven, it escapes at last the necessity of putting on a material body and, freed from the necessity of further choice, remains a pure soul.

Four points may be emphasised in this doctrine. The first three are determinist. First, circumstances (in the myth the circumstance of the lot) influence choices; secondly, a choice once made determines one's destiny and is irrevocable. Thirdly, a choice is not only limited by circumstances but influenced by the past history of the chooser. The purport of the myth of Er is to insist that what is done by the soul upon earth has a direct effect upon its future. Thus the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, involving, as it does, the continuity of its existence, adds to our moral responsibility and increases the importance of living rightly. The concluding words of the *Republic* emphasize the fact that the one thing needful is to study how to make oneself better and wiser, not only for this life but in order that, when one's turn comes to choose another, one may make a correct choice for the future. Life on earth, in fact, is, rightly regarded,

a process of learning and training for that future. The fourth point emphasizes the fact of freedom. In spite of all that has been said the choice of the soul *really is free*; the past, influences and inclines but never necessitates its choice.

Plato, so far as I know, was not directly influenced by the teaching of the East, to which it is improbable that he had access. Nevertheless it is difficult to avoid being struck by the resemblance between this account of freedom and that of Hindu philosophy. Those who are better acquainted with that philosophy than I am will be able to judge how close that resemblance is.

The philosophy of Schopenhauer is admittedly influenced by Eastern Philosophy. For him the reality of things is Will. This is conceived as a universal unconscious urge or thrust, objectified at different levels in living individuals. It is known to us through internal perception, which Schopenhauer calls intuition. Introspect yourself, attend to the actual processes of your own consciousness, he seems to say, and you will establish contact not only with the reality of your ego, but with the fundamental reality of the universe, since this reality of the universe, the Will, is that which, objectified in you, forms the core of your being.

The conception in Schopenhauer's hands issues in the pessimism for which he is most celebrated. The Will, being from its very nature a restless, dynamic flux, expresses itself in human beings as a series of wants and desires. Wanting is a pain and impels us to make efforts to satisfy it. Satisfaction brings pleasure, but this is of necessity fleeting and momentary, since, being dependent upon the satisfaction of the preceding state of need, pleasure cannot persist after the need is satisfied; for the Will, unable to rest in satisfaction, replaces the satisfied need by a new one. Thus those who make self-satisfaction their aim and seek to live a life of pleasure doubly err. In the first place, they endeavour to enjoy that which from its very nature is dependent upon a preceding want or need without undergoing the pain of want upon which it depends; in the second, they endeavour to make permanent that which by its very nature is transitory, overlooking the fact that what is customary is no longer felt as a pleasure. Satisfaction can never be more than deliverance from pain, and it is want, therefore, and not satisfaction that appears as the central fact of life.

So far the analysis is not very different from that of modern psychology, and its implications are equally deterministic. The impulses of the Will are blind; we have, or so it seems, no choice but to obey them, and, since obedience brings only momentary satisfaction, life considered as a transaction in pleasure and pain is bound to be a failure. For, so long as the Will is affirmed, so long are evil and suffering affirmed; yet the root of all life is a Will, and we exist by willing.

We seem here to reach an impasse from which there is no escape. Schopenhauer nevertheless suggests two. The first is by art. Art is conceived as essentially contemplative. The artist has the faculty of continuing in a state of pure perception, of losing his personality in this perception, and of enlisting in its service the knowledge and harnessing the energy of the will. The Will is still affirmed, but it is affirmed not in pursuance of the individual's own aims and interests, but for the renunciation of his personality in contemplation of the world. The escape here is from the circle of personal wants and desires to disinterested knowledge. In art we know and enjoy without wishing to have that which we enjoy.

Similarly there is an escape through ethics. In working out his ethical system Schopenhauer was deeply influenced by Indian philosophy; with the philosophers of Buddhism he identified the end of existence with release from slavery to the impulses of the Will, and proclaimed the practice of asceticism as the best method of achieving such release. The disposition of mind which alone leads to true holiness and to deliverance from desire, finds expression in renunciation of the world. The stage of holiness is ultimately achieved through a denial of the Will to live. Since the energy for this denial can only be supplied by the Will, the Will must be turned against itself. Attaining to a vision of the real nature of life, realising the vain striving, the incessant suffering, the ever recurring desire which it involves, he who would achieve holiness turns away from life to achieve in the end a state of resignation which is the result of voluntary renunciation.

Thus the loftiest goodness consists in the transcendence of desire, and the freedom of the Will is most completely demonstrated in the negation of willing. Whatever we may think of the paradox in which it ends, we must recognise that the whole structure of Schopenhauer's philosophy is built upon a foundation of freedom. He does not merely say that we can be free; he says that we *are* free in virtue of our nature as expressions of the fundamental principle or reality of the universe, which is itself a principle of freedom, being a spontaneous, dynamic will. And if it be objected that this implies freedom for the universe rather than the individual Schopenhauer answers that the individual can himself become free, free, even of the Will by using the dynamic energy of the Will to turn it against itself in contemplation in art and renunciation in ethics.

II

What comfort may we legitimately derive from these doctrines in the light of the contentions of modern psychology? From the hints dropped in Plato two facts emerge. First, a man's choice once made is irrevocable; it determines his destiny in respect of that which he has chosen, and

must needs, therefore, influence all future choices. As the Eastern view puts it, a man having chosen is bound to feel the effects of his choice from the causes he has himself set in motion. Every time a man chooses evil his character is determined by the fact of his choice, and this determination makes it easier for him to choose evil, and make it harder to choose good on the next occasion on which a choice presents itself. In this sense, then, it is true that our choices in determining our actions determine also our characters, and to that extent influence our future choices.

But, and this is the second point, they never necessitate them. Although it becomes harder for me to choose good each time I choose evil, it never becomes impossible. For choice is always free, and no amount of choosing in the past, although it may bias and influence, can ever necessitate a present choice.

One of the best treatments of the subject of Free Will with which I am acquainted is that of St. Thomas Aquinas. The great difficulty in the conception of freedom is that choice is never without a motive, the motive, let us say, to have A rather than B, and the motive may, and often is said to determine the choice. How, then, can the choice be free? The essence of St. Thomas's account is that while I am deliberating between A and B, making a comparison of their respective "goodnesses" on which my act of choice will depend, there is a definite stage of indecision, a period in which I am "indetermined to either alternative". When the comparison is finished and the estimate 'A is better than B' is made, the period of indetermination is over; my will is now *determined*, determined, that is, to take A and leave B, and what it is determined by is my own judgment of their relative worths. Now in making this judgment it is admitted that I shall be influenced by all the factors upon which modern psychology lays stress, by the violence of present desires, the persistence of prejudice, the effects of past habits, the drive of unconscious impulses and, as Plato insists, the bias arising from the sum total of my choices in the past; nor is it contended that it is easy to eliminate the influence of all these factors. But what is necessary as a minimum condition of freedom of choice are the admissions first, that the elimination is sometimes achieved, that we do sometimes make an *impartial* comparative judgment of the relative worths of two goods of which we cannot have both; and choose in accordance with our judgment; and second, that what is achieved sometimes can in theory be achieved always.

Can the admissions be made? I think that they can, but only if we are prepared to accept a metaphysical hypothesis such as that of Schopenhauer, which asserts that the Will, or, as I should prefer to call it, Life is an active spontaneous dynamic principle; to say in fact, that it is really creative in the sense that it can bring something out of nothing. For it is precisely this that Plato's contention that, although biassed by past choices we can nevertheless make new ones which are not determined, Schopenhauer's view that, although we are normally corks bobbing on the waves of impulse and desire which are the Will, we can turn the Will against itself, and the affirmation of Hindu philosophy that, although we are influenced by the force of past Karma, we can ourselves mould that force, can in fact make our own Karma, imply. In other words, the doctrine of free will implies a metaphysical view of reality as itself freedom, with the corollary that that freedom is objectified in our own wills. To reason about the matter is to be convinced by the cogency of the arguments that make for determinism. It is only to a faculty of intuitive apprehension, to our consciousness of the fundamental character of our own experience in choosing, that the fact of freedom is revealed.

C. E. M. JOAD

WILL

In metaphysics and occult philosophy, Will is that which governs the manifested universes in eternity. *Will* is the one and sole principle of abstract eternal MOTION, or its ensouling essence. "The will," says Van Helmont, "is the first of all powers . . .The will is the property of all spiritual beings and displays itself in them the more actively the more they are freed from matter." And Paracelsus teaches that "determined will is the beginning of all magical operations. It is because men do not perfectly imagine and believe the result, that the (occult) arts are so uncertain, while they might be perfectly certain". Like all the rest, the Will is *septenary* in its degrees of manifestation. Emanating from the one, eternal, abstract and purely quiescent Will (Ātmâ in Layam), it becomes Buddhi in its Alaya state, descends lower as Mahat (Manas), and runs down the ladder of degrees until the divine Eros becomes, in its lower, animal manifestation, *erotic* desire. Will as an eternal principle is neither spirit nor substance but everlasting ideation. As well expressed by Schopenhauer in his *Parerga*, "in sober reality there is neither *matter* nor *spirit*. The tendency to gravitation in a stone is as unexplainable as thought in the human brain. . . . . .If matter can—no one knows why—fall to the ground, then it can also—no one knows why—think. . . . . .As soon, even in mechanics, as we trespass beyond the purely mathematical, as soon as we reach the inscrutable adhesion, gravitation, and so on, we are faced by phenomena which are to our senses as mysterious as the WILL".

—H. P. BLAVATSKY (*Glossary*)

THE RESURRECTION OF THE PAST

[**Ralph Van Deman Magoffin** is the President of the Archæological Institute of America and Head of the Department of Classics of the New York University. In this article he describes how the life and culture of past civilizations have now become living realities. More than ever they call the expert builders of our modern world to acknowledge the vast superiority of their ancient sires. What was said in 1877 is even more true to-day; H. P. Blavatsky then wrote: "The more archæology and philosophy advance, the more humiliating to our pride are the discoveries which are daily made, the more glorious testimony do they bear in behalf of those who, perhaps on account of the distance of their remote antiquity, have been until now considered ignorant flounderers in the deepest mire of superstition."

No longer can the modern world talk of savage superstitions; to-day it marvels and stands awed in the presence of ancient works of beauty—but is even that sufficient? What ideals inspired the rulers, the instructors, the builders of old compared to whom our kings, educators and architects are but pigmies?—EDS.]

To resurrect the past is to raise either the dead or the presumably dead. The spirit of the past is very much alive as art, and philosophy, law, and literature show in their own acknowledgment of tradition. The not long distant past lives in physiognomy, in habits, in racial and family certainties. What is here under discussion however is the resurrection of the distant, the classic, the supposedly unreclaimable past.

The heavenward pointing pyramids and the Sphinx of the valley of the Nile have never been lost to view. They have always been mysterious indices to an Egyptian civilization long since supposedly dead, for the sketchy accounts in Herodotus and in various of the Roman writers gave an inkling only even of these ephemeral characteristics of life which always die from recurrent change. It was not until 1799 that there occurred the accidental discovery of a stone, called the Rosetta Stone because it was found at the Rosetta mouth of the Nile, on which were engraved three inscriptions. One was in undecipherable hieroglyphic, one in a shorthand variety of the hieroglyphic, the demotic, but the third was in Greek, a language still alive and known. It took years of the trial and error method before the guess that the inscriptions were a trilingual triplicate could be proved. Before many years more had passed, the wealth of the unknown stories of Egyptian antiquity which covered the sides of obelisks, temples, and sarcophagi, had repaid a thousandfold the interest of the world, avid for the resurrection of the culture and civilization of the great nation that had "lived, moved, and had its being" in the fertile valley of the Nile.

During the century or more since the decipherment of the hieroglyphics on the Rosetta Stone not only the historical facts desired, but Egyptian life in its varied forms have become part and

parcel of the world's increasing knowledge. The pyramids were entered and explored; mastabas, *i.e.*, tombs of the nobility, were found buried in the sand, their mummified occupants surrounding their Pharaoh in his pyramid tomb even as they had surrounded him in life.

Later, another type of royal tomb was found far up the Nile in the sides of the cliffs. At the end of long passages cut back into the rock the Pharaohs of later dynasties came again to light and became personages whose life, whose religious thoughts and fears, and whose wealth and power could be estimated and evaluated. In other tombs were found figurines of artisans, overseers, slaves, and animals, all in miniature, and performing, as in a puppet show, the tasks which in life those whom they represented had performed.

The resurrection of Tutankhamen however was the *tour de force* of archæologists in Egypt. To bring again to life, except that in his case it is to a life that will now last forever, the last of the Pharaohs, and the one Pharaoh whose tomb had never been disturbed, was nothing short of a stupendous event. No other single find has matched it in international interest. The great gesso-gilt sarcophagus which contained other smaller sarcophagi, among which was one, the walls of which were of solid gold; the marvellous sarcophagus of pink alabaster, unique in all the world; the plethora of funerary equipment, the splendid throne chair and the ecclesiastical chair, or faldstool, the chests full of articles in gold, silver, ivory, ebony, set with precious and semi-precious gems, and carved or decorated in the best style of the period: these were a treasure trove indeed which have enriched and illuminated the thus resurrected life of the time of Tutankhamen.

The fertile valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates which we usually call Mesopotamia, teemed with life in the five or six millennia B. C. Of Persians, of Assyrians, of Babylonians, we knew but the Akkadians and the Sumerians were buried beneath the remains of those later civilizations. Archæologists have but recently resurrected these very ancient people from their long forgotten tombs, and they now live and dwell among us in historic reality. Harps of ten and twelve strings, that date thousands of years B. C. surprise us with the certainty that music in those long gone days had reached a pitch that transcended in variety the simple octave of to-day. The skeletal remains and the wonderful headdress of Queen Shub-Ad, found broken in hundreds of pieces of its thin gold and gem-encrusted delicacy, and the courtiers lying in serried rank on the tomb floor, brought most vividly to life the picture of the power over life and death of a ruler—one of many—whose very name had seemingly been lost in oblivion. When the expedition from the Field Museum in Chicago discovered the

copper-rimmed wheels of the oldest chariot in the world, the imagination at once saw as clearly as in life the chariots of ancient days rolling in triumph or to war. The recent discovery of a seven-foot stratum of riverine deposit with not a single artifact in it, and below which are pieces of broken pottery, and above which are thousands of unbroken pots and other objects like the broken ones below, has stirred the religious world; for the claim has been made, and with much probability of success, that the riverine deposit is that laid down by the Flood mentioned in the Old Testament, and perhaps, the very one of which many traditions of great floods of those early days are well known.

To resurrect a civilization like that in Crete which had entirely disappeared or been forgotten would seem almost to strain the bounds of credibility. Yet that is what archæology had done. Americans, Italians, and Greeks may be allowed some of the credit, but to Arthur Evans, now Sir Arthur Evans, of England must go the lion's share.

Ancient Egypt was lost under shifting sand, and Mesopotamia was buried in flood-mud and sand. The story of the Trojan war guaranteed settlements in Asia Minor and in continental Greece. But between Egypt and Mesopotamia and historic Greece there was a great and inexplicable gap. When Evans found the palace of the legendary Minos at Cnossus in Crete, and when other Cretan sides of places of great ancient power came to light, and when the ceramists classified Cretan pottery in sequences that ran from 3000 to 1400 B.C., the Minoan Civilization, a great sea power in the early Ægean, rose, first like a wraith, and then growing to be a living archæological organism of flesh and blood, and filled that historical gap with a third world power, contemporaneous with the two already known. The palace at Cnossus with its water system, its bath tubs of porcelain, its lower chambers full of great *pithoi* for the storage of grain, oil, and treasure, its marvellous painted walls with contemporaneous scenes of the life of the court, these and many other things, resurrected an entirely forgotten culture to its proper place in the historical life of the ancient world. The Phaestos disk offered its problem on early language, the Greek text of Cretan law on the stones of the mill-dam at Gortyna, the fauna and flora painted on hundreds of Cretan vases, gave surroundings and atmosphere and undoubted reality to that wonderful island that shuts the Ægean off from the Mediterranean, that island which may well have contained the civilization—forgotten by the Greeks which inhabited the long lost isle of Atlantis. Plato must have known the legends and the tradition, and oddly enough his description of Atlantis as one comes to it from the north is strangely like the horizon view of Crete to-day, as one comes down to it from Athens or the north.

One may read in the Scriptures of Jerusalem that "the Amorite was thy father, and thy mother a Hittite," that Jebus (Jerusalem) was a brother of Heth, and that Uriah the Hittite lived at Jerusalem. But no one imagined that the Hittites were other than one of the many small tribes that lived in tiny Palestine. But in Egyptian and Mesopotamian history a people, whose name in general we may write as Hatti, began to loom large. Suddenly the archæological world was electrified by the announcement of the discovery of a great town of the Hatti in the bend of the Halys river in Anatolia, in and under the modern Turkish town of Boghaz-Keui. It turned out to be the capital of the ancient Hittites, and in it were found the answers, inscribed in Mesopotamian cuneiform letters, to diplomatic correspondence already found in Egypt. Explorers and archæologists began to find scores of Hittite towns and monuments all over Anatolia, and an Hittite Empire was suddenly resurrected from the limbo of the past. Only a few of the Hittite sites have been partially excavated, but over a thousand are now known, and are marked for future archæological work. Alongside the Minoan civilization another culture has been resurrected into historical life, and takes its place as the fourth great world power of Near East antiquity with Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Crete.

In Greece, the British at Mycenæ and Sparta have brought to light and life older civilization than was known. The American School at Athens has resurrected ancient Corinth, and has just begun on what may prove to be the most important work ever done in Greece. It is laying bare the ancient *agora*, or market place, of Athens. From the inscriptions alone which are almost sure to be found, military, commercial, and diplomatic documents will restore to historic certainty much of the workings of government, and of international treaties, of which we are unaware, and which will give us a much more complete picture of ancient Greece. Robinson of John Hopkins has resurrected ancient Olynthus, the town destroyed by Philip, the father of Alexander the Great.

In the Italy the discoveries are almost legion. The early Christians have been resurrected from the Catacombs ; we have become acquainted with every one of the Roman emperors and empresses from their portraits in discovered statues or in coins dug from the ground. We know how the early Roman cast his "Australian," or secret, ballot, because it is stamped pictorially on a series of silver *denarii*. The daily life of the Romans from birth to death is absolutely guaranteed to us in historical relief sculpture, in thousands of square yards of wall paintings, and in actual objects also, such as silver dinner services, tools and weapons and kitchen implements, in beds and tables and lead water pipe.

As much as has been known from history, so much more is now so fully illustrated by archæological finds that the Greeks and Romans actually live for us to-day in almost more lively verity than they themselves lived.

Scoffing had no effect on the beliefs of a young German boy named Heinrich Schliemann, whose reading of Homer had fired him with a belief in Troy, and Helen of Troy, and Agamemnon, Achilles, Hector, and Aeneas. When he had finally made money enough he went to Asia Minor near the entrance to the Dardanelles, and found the Troy which he had been told was nothing more than a lively piece of Greek imagination. Then he found in the Peloponnesus in Greece, Mycenæ the golden city of King Agamemnon, and Tiryns the strong fortress of his predecessors in Argive rank. The world stopped laughing at Schliemann for he had resurrected from a doubted story the reality that lay at the base of what we now know is the history of part of the great struggle of the invading Indo-European Hellenes against the Mediterranean peoples who had inhabited the Ægean lands for millennia, and who were the builders of the Minoan, and its late flower, the Mycenean civilizations. Andromache and Astyanax, so beautifully made alive for us by the sculptor Edward Valentine of Virginia, Aeneas whom Virgil made one of the great characters of a superb epic, Ajax, and Ulysses and his faithful Penelope, the charming princess Nausicaa, Achilles and Patroclus, Menelaus, Helen, and Paris, Priam and Hector, Laocoon and Sinon, all these are more alive to-day than many people who have not yet died.

And the resurrections yet to come! The Indus, the Brahmaputra, and the Ganges in India have deep under the fertile soil that lines their banks, unguessed civilizations of splendour that will some day be brought to the light and life of historical day. Coming events cast their shadows before and such are the great early civilizations uncovered by Sir John Marshall at the sites of Harappa and Mohenjo-daro.

The resurrection of the ancient past is the work of one of the now livest—and liveliest—of modern sciences.

RALPH VAN DEMAN MAGOFFIN

FIVE LIGHTS AT THE CROSS ROADS

II. APOLLONIUS OF TYANA

[**Geoffrey West** is presenting five biographical studies of mystics and miracle-workers who lived about the first century A. D. In our March number he wrote on "Ptolemy Soter"; the next one on "Simon Magus" will appear in our July issue.—EDS.]

Three hundred years after the death of Ptolemy, Serapis had become but one more god, though a powerful one, among the many, and upon the Museum had fallen the shadow of pedantry. Yet Alexandria flourished, other more vital schools had arisen, and the Library remained a centre for students from all over the known civilised world. Rome had usurped the power of Greece. Men were free not only to worship what gods they would but also to travel in quest of new knowledge. After many centuries, perhaps millenniums, direct contact with the wisdom of the East was being tentatively re-established. Alexandria played its part. It was the gateway between East and West. It had its Indian merchants, its Indian colony even. The Library, almost certainly, held its treasure of Indian manuscripts. And beckoned by these suggestions, rarely wise men, like Apollonius of Tyana, would follow in the footsteps of Pythagoras towards India itself, returning with authority in bearing and voice, the power to work those wonders which ignorance alone miscalled miracle, and a knowledge that might be spoken only to those worthy to receive it.

The modernist attitude to Apollonius is simple—even ingenuous. Western science, scanning the reports of an ability beyond its own, would declare him mainly if not entirely legendary. Christianity, treading more warily on dangerous ground, would label him at least impostor, and indeed if the point is insisted upon, the principal sources of his history have as dubious an origin as some of the Christian gospels themselves. Apollonius had been dead well over a hundred years when Philostratus constructed his account from such information as was open to him, principally the note-books of his subject's disciple, Damis. Moreover, Philostratus anticipated in many ways the methods of modern biography; he embroidered where the material ran thin, and where gaps appeared he invented to the best of his practised ability. Yes, scepticism is easy, and yet there is a wiser way—to take this Apollonius, to study him for what he is worth, and to let the imagination declare what in him be false or true.

He was born in Cappadocia, at Tyana, probably about the close of the first decade of the Christian era. The first settled

date in his life is the year 66, when he was exiled from Rome with other philosophers who spoke too frankly against Nero's tyrannies, but at this time he cannot have been less than fifty, and may well have been more. His parents were wealthy, but he early revealed an ascetic, studious nature, and his intellectual ability was as marked as his physical beauty. At fourteen he went to Tarsus, the nearest centre of learning, but the schools proved academic, and he journeyed on to Ægae, on the sea-coast, there taking up his residence among the priests of the temple of Æsculapius, and studying under Platonic, Stoic, Peripatetic, and Epicurean teachers, learning the Phœnician sciences from Euthydemus, and the Pythagorean, from Euxenus of Heraclea. Everywhere he found more bewilderment and inquiry than any sure knowledge. Paganism, having left unheeded the lesson of Serapis, was dying of inanition, and in the absence of new impulse religion for the greater number degenerated into superstition, a mere wonder-seeking. A truer spirit survived, mainly within the temples and among those who went to live apart in religious communities. The Pythagoreans in particular were known for their pure, ascetic lives, and to their discipline and their study Apollonius finally inclined. From youth he followed their rule to eat no meat and drink no wine, to wear only linen and leave the hair uncut, and when at twenty he inherited his father's wealth he gave it freely away to a brother and other needing relatives. He took a vow of five years' silence, and later as a teacher imposed a similar test upon all who sought to be his intimate pupils.

The next twenty years were spent in continuous travel about the Near East from temple to temple, community to community, exchanging his wisdom with such as were worthy, and gathering about him a little group of disciples who revered him as a teacher of the hidden way. He was in his middle forties when he set out for India, saying to his pupils who sought to dissuade him: "Since you are faint-hearted, I bid you farewell. As for myself I must go whithersoever wisdom and my inner self may lead me. The Gods are my advisers and I can but rely on their counsels." Thus he went alone until Damis, meeting him on the way, recognised his knowledge and holiness, and begged to share with him the burden and danger of the way. He returned eventually by way of Babylon and Greece to Rome; then, banished by Nero, journeyed on to Spain, crossed over to North Africa, and came by a devious route to Alexandria, where he met the future emperor Vespasian in 68 or 69. Thence he travelled up the Nile to spend probably some years with a religious community in Ethiopia.

He next appears in Alexandria during the visit of Titus in 80 or 81. Followed another decade of travel and teaching, until in 93 he was called to Rome to be

tried for denouncing the tyrant Domitian. He was acquitted by Domitian himself, and established his school at Ephesus, where there occurred three years later a famous instance of his visionary powers. He was delivering a philosophical address to a large audience, when he seemed to lose the thread of his discourse. He paused, stared intently before him, and cried in a loud voice: "Strike the tyrant, strike!" He then informed his astonished pupils of Domitian's assassination, though the news did not otherwise reach the city for several days. It is not known where, or even how, Apollonius died. The faithful Damis, being sent by him to Rome, returned to find him unaccountably gone. It is only a modern writer's suggestion that he might perhaps have rejoined his Indian teachers.

Whatever the fact of that, clearly the Indian visit was his life's turning-point. What came before led up to it; what followed derived from it. It is therefore unfortunate, however inevitable, that we learn so little of his actual contact with the Hindu Sages, but rather perhaps should we be grateful for even the little we have, for such a silence persists at the hearts of the records of all great teachers—and possibly too we should attribute our dissatisfaction to our own ignorance, for some learned ones would declare the whole account of the Indian journey the allegorical representation of the trials of a neophyte! In any case it is only what we should expect, for Damis was far from being an initiate, and was compelled to remain behind in the palace of a hospitable king while his master went onward to the home of the Sages. For his subsequent questioning Damis received little more than cryptic replies: "I saw men dwelling on the earth and yet not on it, defended on all sides, yet without any defence, and yet possessed of nothing but what all possess." The interpretation of this—that being concerned with spiritual things They were raised above material attack by the development of powers inherent in all—is confirmed in their statements to Apollonius that they were gods because they were good men, "omniscient just because we begin with self-knowledge; none of us may approach this philosophy of ours until he know himself first of all". Few things are in fact clearer in the life of Apollonius than that his so-called magical powers grew only with his own self-knowledge and purification. In his youth he had to master foreign languages like any one else; only gradually did he learn to read the thoughts of men directly, and only after his Indian initiation could he work those wonders, ascribed to all great teachers, which reveal him a philosopher in the Pythagorean sense of one intimate with nature's higher laws. On leaving the Sages he told them: "I will continue to enjoy your conversation as if still with you."

He returned from India as one

whose mission was now assured. Who, a priest of Alexandria asked him, was wise enough to reform the religion of the Egyptians, and he replied: "Any Sage who comes from the Indians." Later, recalling to the Ethiopian Gymnosophists the ancient eastern origin of their doctrines, and urging them to follow his own adopted rule of life and discipline of silence, he spoke clearly as one having authority:

> But if you endure this ordeal, hear now your reward: temperance and righteousness shall be yours unbidden; you shall reckon no man worth envy, be rather a terror to despots than subject to them; and be more acceptable in the sight of the gods for a little incense than are those who pour forth the blood of bulls to them. And I will give you, being pure, the gift of second sight, and so fill your eyes with rays of light that you shall discern a god, recognise a demi-god, and convict ghosts when they deceitfully assume human shape.

So he himself appears throughout his later years, having the calm serenity of the truly wise man—charming, charitable, lovable, witty, energetic, fearless of death, penetrating in discernment but merciful in condemnation, a very god among men both physically and intellectually, able to wield high powers of healing, divination, vision at a distance, and yet rejecting their use merely to make men marvel. His teaching was truly theosophical, as revealed not only in his general Pythagorean outlook, but also in his fundamental distinction between soul and body, his knowledge of the kinship of all being, his declaration that every man held within himself the possibility of perfection. Always he held to the path of practical moderation and spiritual wisdom, attacking superstition, asserting no dogmas, acknowledging no differences of race or creed, and accepting all religions as righteous if the true spirit of understanding were present in them. To each, he held, his own appointed path; for all, followed rightly, led to a single salvation. He was a moral philosopher rigidly holding aloof from politics yet speaking fearlessly against the tyrannies of Nero and Domitian, and even on occasion, of Vespasian, who, like Titus and Nerva, was his friend.

Nowhere is the height of his austere wisdom more clearly revealed, perhaps, than in his attitude to prayer, which, with meditation, he performed regularly, yet as a self-exercise and communion rather than with any desire to secure divine intervention, for he held that not even the supreme Deity could wash away the stain of murder, and declared the noblest appeal to be one of simple acceptance: "Give me, ye Gods, what is my due." The essence of his teaching appears in the saying—from one of several treatises of which only fragments survive—that "the only fitting sacrifice to God is man's best reason, and not the word that comes from out his mouth".

Such is the man portrayed by Philostratus, and there are other witnesses, even among the Christian Fathers, to the wide esteem in which Apollonius was held long after his death or passing. Statues and other monuments were erected to his memory in the third century, and controversy really commenced only a little later when Hierocles opposed the well-attested "miracles" of Apollonius to the Christian claim that the wonders worked by Jesus proved a unique divinity. Thenceforward orthodox criticism and derogation steadily increased; yet to the eighth, eleventh and even thirteenth centuries there is evidence of reverence or at least respect. Only in the sixteenth century and subsequently does one find the account of Philostratus attacked and dismissed as no more than a plagiarism of the life of Jesus—an idea which certainly never occurred even to the bitterest of earlier critics!

It has been charged against Apollonius as a mark of inferiority that he left but few disciples, and no formal organisation, no church. Can those who have their church be called the happier? Is not every religious organisation, of human necessity, the Judas of its founder, that betrays as it kisses him? Better, surely, the solitary appeal to those able to respond. Better, surely, the simple unadorned personality of Apollonius than the distorted, incredible, hypocritical Jesus of the squabbling Christian Churches.

"Was Apollonius, then," asks G. R. S. Mead, "a trickster, a charlatan, a fanatic, a misguided enthusiast, or a philosopher, a reformer, a conscious worker, a true initiate, one of the earth's great ones? This each must decide for himself, according to his knowledge or his ignorance."

GEOFFREY WEST

Apollonius, a contemporary of Jesus of Nazareth, was, like him, an enthusiastic founder of a new spiritual school. Perhaps less metaphysical and more practical than Jesus, less tender and perfect in his nature, he nevertheless inculcated the same quintessence of spirituality, and the same high moral truths. His great mistake was to confine them too closely to the higher classes of society. While to the poor and the humble Jesus preached "Peace on earth and good will to men," Apollonius was the friend of kings, and moved with the aristocracy. He was born among the latter, and himself a man of wealth, while the "Son of man," representing the people, "had not where to lay his head;" nevertheless, the two "miracle-workers" exhibited striking similarity of purpose . . . .

Like Buddha and Jesus, Apollonius was the uncompromising enemy of all outward show of piety, all display of useless religious ceremonies and hypocrisy . . . .

If we study the question with a dispassionate mind, we will soon perceive that the ethics of Gautama-Buddha, Plato, Apollonius, Jesus, Ammonius Sakkas, and his disciples, were all based on the same mystic philosophy. That all worshipped one God, whether they considered Him as the "Father" of humanity, who lives in man as man lives in Him, or as the Incomprehensible Creative Principle; all led God-like lives.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, pp. 341–342

DREAMS OF FUTURE EVENTS

[R. L. **Mégroz** began his career as an office-boy in London, became a bank clerk, and rose to be assistant manager. Then the War broke out and he joined the army gathering experience in Gallipoli, Egypt, Sinai and France. A long list of publications is already to his credit—verse, biography, and literary studies being among the fields tilled.

In this article Mr. Mégroz remarks upon the method of science which substitutes a new theory for an old one, without progressing; this was foreseen by H. P. Blavatsky who wrote in 1888 in *The Secret Doctrine* (I. 133–134):

> "Science is welcome to speculate upon the physiological mechanism of living beings, and to continue her fruitless efforts in trying to resolve our feelings, our sensations, mental and spiritual, into functions of their inorganic vehicles. Nevertheless, all that will ever be accomplished in this direction has already been done, and Science will go no farther. She is before a dead wall, on the face of which she traces, as she imagines, great physiological and psychic discoveries, but every one of which will be shown later on to be no better than the cobwebs spun by her scientific fancies and illusions."

—EDS.]

In a previous article which received the hospitality of THE ARYAN PATH (March 1931), I attempted to trace the constant interest in dreams in the western world right back to the earliest historical records of ancient Egypt. The subject was too big to cover in more than a very discursive manner, but the principal outcome of the survey was that most people—great sages, powerful men of action, and "ordinary" individuals like ourselves—at all times were aware of something to wonder at in the common experience of dreaming. The motives which arouse a deep interest in dreams have always varied widely; there seems at first nothing in common between the terrors of a hermit Saint Antony and the concern of an ambitious Roman General or an Emperor as to the light thrown by his dream upon the result of a battle or a political manœuvre on the morrow. But there is in both a conviction of something important to the self in the dream. It is a conviction which is entirely opposed to the sceptical attitude of a materialistic science relying upon new sets of terms like "nerves" and "hysteria," not to explain but to explain away inexplicable phenomena. Even the new-old science of psycho-analysis, which undoubtedly throws light upon the profoundest emotions that express themselves in dream-imagery, is emphatically repudiated as a sufficient explanation of certain kinds of dream-experiences.

The Editors of THE ARYAN PATH followed my last article with interesting quotations from an Appendix on Dreams in *Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge.* Among them was a seven-fold classification of dreams, as Prophetic, Allegorical, Inspired by other minds, Restrospective, Warning (for others), Confused, Chaotic and Fanciful. This list, and the comments made on it, help one to think about a subject that is at present a morass of confused ideas. But like all attempts at scientific classification, it replaces things by names, and in doing so sets up purely intellectual distinctions which only very roughly correspond with reality.* The first group in that list, Prophetic Dreams, is the only one ascribed to the "Higher Self". The last one, "Dreams which are mere fancies and chaotic pictures" are said to be "owing to digestion, some mental trouble, or such-like external cause". But physical or emotional disturbance may accompany (and, it seems to me even induce) visions of the highest religious or artistic value (according to the character of the individual). The materialistic heresy, for instance, that mysticism was the product of a diseased mind or body, was based mainly upon biographical study of mystics and seers. I think, too, that a chaotic dream may often be a prophetic dream which cannot or at least is not, understood and interpreted. Here again we come to the importance of the quality of the individual mind. To take the simplest possible example, it is conceivable that two individuals might have a dream of similar value and intensity; for one of them it might become a vaguely remembered piece of nonsense to relate over the breakfast table, while the other might derive a religious or an artistic inspiration from a contemplation of the dream. The most chaotic nightmare, following the most indigestible of suppers, is none the less mysterious in one aspect, for we know nothing about the substance of the dream objects or how they are created by the mind, notwithstanding all our theories about tangled emotions and physical stimuli. This is a statement which no scientific materialist would accept, so if we want to stress the metaphysical importance of dream experiences it is easier to abandon the many dreams which cannot be definitely removed from scientific "explanations" and to challenge those who regard dreams as mere hallucinations with a species which has defied scientific explanation.

This is the dream which reflects the future instead of the past. You can go right back to the ancient Egyptians or to the ancient Chaldees and you will find that a belief in the possibility of dreaming the future has been always an important element of divination. That mysterious pool of ancient wisdom which has undoubtedly fructified temporary religions and civilisations contains a knowledge of the self which is partly a knowledge of how to distinguish the nature of various dreams and to interpret them. And that knowledge (which must, I suppose, be called occult, though I dislike the implications of the word) has always confirmed the existence of a

* A careful study of the *whole* Transaction will reveal to our author that the table is more logical than he at present thinks.—EDS.

faculty in us for dreaming future events.

I find that over half a century ago H. P. Blavatsky was using this very argument of the unexplained prophetic dream against the scientific materialist, and pointing out that "if one single instance stubbornly refuses classification with 'strange co-incidences' —so much in favour with sceptics— then, prophetic, or verified dreams would demand an entire remodelling of physiology." *

While modern science continues to "progress" by upsetting the theories of earlier scientists about the nature of the universe and substituting new theories which will, by further progress, in turn be superseded, the study of the subject of dreams has also developed, but in a direction disconcerting to the sceptic. The publication two years ago of *An Experiment with Time* by J. W. Dunne was an inevitable development of the latest advances made in physics. But it proves to be scientific only in its methods of induction and deduction, for Mr. Dunne's thesis is too staggering to be acceptable to what is called science in the western world. It is nothing less than an assertion, supported by experiment and mathematical demonstration, that the faculty of knowing future events, and even of preventing them, is inherent in the human mind. In his prefatory Note to the second edition of *An Experiment with Time*, the author says :—

It has been rather surprising to discover how many persons there are who, while willing to concede that we habitually observe events before they occur, suppose that such prevision may be treated as a minor logical difficulty, to be met by some trifling readjustment in one or another of our sciences or by the addition of a dash of transcendentalism to our metaphysics. It may well be emphasized that no tinkering or doctoring of that kind could avail in the smallest degree. If prevision be a fact, it is a fact which destroys absolutely the entire basis of all our past opinions of the universe. Bear in mind, for example, that the foreseen event may be avoided.

The interested reader may go to *An Experiment with Time* to find the records of the author's own dream-anticipations of events. These dreams had better not be confused with prophetic visions, although the mental processes involved may ultimately be similar. A prophetic vision is the anticipatory dream charged with mystical wisdom; its imagery is full of symbolism referring to spiritual values; it is a picture of human existence from an unearthly angle or point of view. Translated into the terms of a homely story it is a parable. Instead of illustrating it from the visions of the great religious mystics, I suggest that the following account by the great dramatist Ibsen of a dream is a kind of vision with a prophetic quality in it, and that it is told as a parable:—

While wandering on a high mountain range with some friends, I like them became tired and despondent. We were suddenly surprised by night, and like Jacob we lay down to sleep, resting our heads on stones. My companions soon went off to sleep, but I was not so successful. Finally I succumbed to weariness and in a dream an angel appeared before me, saying: "Arise, and follow me."

"Whither will you lead me in this darkness?" I asked, and received the reply: "Come, I will reveal to you human existence in its true reality."

Full of foreboding, I followed my guide and we descended a number of deep steps, and rocks towered above us like gigantic arches. Before us lay a great city of death with horrible remnants and tokens of mortality, and transient existence; an immense sunken world of corpses, death's silent subjects. Over all hovered a faded grandeur, a withered twilight enveloping church-walls, graves and sepulchres, and in a stronger light row upon row of white skeletons reflected a phosphorescent glow. A fear seized me as I stood by the angel's side. "Here, you see, all is vanity!" he said. Then arose a roar as of a coming storm, which grew to a raging hurricane, so that the dead moved and stretched their arms towards me, and with a cry I awoke wet from the cold dew of night.

When the psychologist reads this, he at once begins pointing out the personal sources of the imagery, the bleak, mountainous scenery and the weariness and unease of the despondent traveller who fell asleep in such an inhospitable place. But there remains in the vision the realisation, born out of the wisdom of the human race, of a spiritual truth that we can recognise by sharing the dreamer's unfamiliar point of view. When fear of death does not dominate the picture, the dreamer may, like Henry Vaughan, apprehend "the World of Light" that encircles us.

So some strange thoughts transcend our wonted themes,
And into glory peep.

But the subject of prophetic visions is tremendous, and it does not offer the hard little pebble of an ascertained fact needed by the scientific and the commonsense mind as evidence. That is why physical science finds much more troublesome such a fact as that Swedenborg in Amsterdam should have suddenly exclaimed to the company about him that the royal palace in Christiania was on fire. It was, but how did he know? We must have terms for our theoretical explanations, so instead of questioning the commonsense view of space, we decided to call it telepathy. The less scientific called it clairvoyance. So, again, in face of instances of what the Scotch called "second-sight," a vision of a coming disaster, no one dared to question the commonsense view of time, and it seemed possible only to say "coincidence," or simply ignore the belief in "second-sight," as ignorant superstition. But it is carrying indifference too far to dismiss the records of all the ages like this, and they are all marked by similar beliefs.

Let us leave out the instances of anticipatory dreams of Roman Emperors and generals, and others who lived long enough ago for their dreams to have been the creations of legend, ignoring even the strangest confirmations by contemporary historians. Records of such dreams have continued in the modern world, right up to Mr. Dunne's experiments. Who does

* *The Theosophist*, Vol. III, p. 104.

not know of the well authenticated dream of President Lincoln a few days before his assassination? Broaching the subject very reluctantly to his wife, and refusing to admit that he believed in dreams, he described the latest dream that had so troubled his peace of mind. It was almost like a report of his own assassination and the scenes which followed it. Five years before this, in 1860, he had seen a double image of himself in the mirror. One image was healthy and lifelike, the other ghastly and like a wraith. Easy to dismiss this as a freak of imagination, born of unacknowledged fears, but then there are scores, probably hundreds of recorded cases of what were called "döppelgangers" in the eighteenth century. The idea, always held to be a superstition, that for a person to see the double of himself was a forewarning of death, grew up in the middle ages, and it was exploited in every conceivable way by novelists and poets of the "romantic terror" school between 1750 and 1850. Actually the döppelganger legend was in existence in the ancient world, and merely proved more attractive to the medieval mind. The instance of a person seeing another's double is that of Donne, the poet who became Dean of St. Paul's. It is well known, owing to Izaak Walton's biography. Donne had accompanied the English ambassador to Paris, leaving his wife who expected a child shortly. The day after his arrival he saw his wife pass across the room, her hair hanging down, and a dead child in her arms. An urgent request for news was sent by a special messenger, who returned to tell Donne that his wife was ill but alive, and that at the time of his vision she had given birth to a dead child.

The Journal of the evangelist, Wesley, contains many records of unexplained forewarnings in dream and trance, which anybody may read. If a fiery evangelist may be considered unreliable on such a subject, what has a sceptic to say to the note by Samuel Taylor Coleridge in a letter to his friend Poole, in 1797? He recalled how his father, in September 1781, accompanied another son, Francis, to Plymouth, where the youth was to join a ship as midshipman. On his way back he arrived at Exeter early in the evening and was pressed to take a bed there for the night by some friends. He refused, and explained that he had been deeply impressed the night before by a dream of his death. He returned home, apparently in the best of health, and after a festive supper with his family went to bed. That night he died in bed.

A curious dream which resembles some of those described by Mr. Dunne, is the following one recorded by Frederick Greenwood in *Imagination in Dreams* (1894):—

> One night I dreamt that, making a call on some matter of business I was shown into a fine great drawing room and asked to wait. Accordingly, I went over to the fire-place in the usual English way, proposing to wait there. And there, after the same fashion, I lounged with my arm upon the mantelpiece; but only for a few moments. For feeling that my fingers had rested on something strangely cold, I looked, and saw that they lay on a dead hand; a woman's hand newly cut from the wrist.
>
> Though I awoke in horror on the instant, this dream was quite forgotten—at any rate for the time—when I did next day make a call on some unimportant matter of business, was shown into a pretty little room adorned with various knick-knacks, and then was asked to wait. Glancing by chance toward the mantelpiece (the dream of the previous night still forgotten), what should I see upon it but the hand of a mummy, broken from the wrist. It was a very little hand, and on it was a ring that would have been a "gem ring" if the dull red stone in it had been genuinely precious. Wherefore I concluded that it was a woman's hand.
>
> Coincidence. The dream certainly taught me nothing, and had no discernible purpose. Yet visions of severed hands on mantelpieces are not common, and, with or without previous dreaming of it, few men have actually seen one, even when taken from a mummy case, in that precise situation. Now had I myself rifled the tomb where she reposed from whom the relic was torn, or had I by any means acquired that poor little brown hand to make bric-a-brac of it, my dream would have been pertinent enough. Then it would have made a pretty tale, with a moral that is not unneeded, perhaps. But, as it is, we can make nothing better of it than a dream gone astray.

Just so. Before Mr. Dunne set himself to systematise, with the scientist's own methods, what unexplained knowledge our more strange dreams may have to teach us, they were dismissed as freaks. It may be, it is indeed, certain, that a great deal of pertinent experience, of this kind, was never recorded during the sceptical nineteenth century just because nobody saw how it could be taken seriously. Before the nineteenth century, the lack of care in recording strange dreams of the future make them unauthentic as evidence for the scientific mind. It does not seem an exaggeration of the facts to say that with our modern scientific methods of recording experience and with the door opened to a realisation of the tremendous possibilities of more knowledge, the study of dreams must in the western world of to-day assume an importance equal to that of mathematics and astronomy. For in it lies a key to so much knowledge that we have forgotten.

R. L. MÉGROZ

THE IMPERSONAL GOD OF THE SUFIS

[**Mumtaz Armstrong**, Editor of *The Sufi Quarterly*, was introduced to our readers last October when he wrote on "The Jesuits". The Impersonal Deity taught by the Sufis, truly interpreted, is the Atman of the Vedantins. The position of the Theosophist-Occultist is made clear by H. P Blavatsky (*Secret Doctrine* I, 8–9) thus :—

Space is neither a "limitless void," nor a "conditioned fulness," but both: being, on the plane of absolute abstraction, the ever-incognisable Deity, which is void only to finite minds, and on that of *mayavic* perception, the Plenum, the absolute Container of all that is, whether manifested or unmanifested: it is, therefore, that ABSOLUTE ALL. There is no difference between the Christian Apostle's "In Him we live and move and have our being," and the Hindu Rishi's "The Universe lives in, proceeds from, and will return to, Brahma (Brahmâ):" for Brahma (neuter), the unmanifested, is that Universe *in abscondito*, and Brahmâ, the manifested, is the Logos, made male-female in the symbolical orthodox dogmas. The God of the Apostle-Initiate and of the Rishi being both the Unseen and the Visible SPACE. Space is called in the esoteric symbolism "the Seven-Skinned Eternal Mother-Father." It is composed from its undifferentiated to its differentiated surface of seven layers.

"What is that which was, is, and will be, whether there IS a Universe or not; whether there be gods or none?" asks the esoteric Senzar Catechism. And the answer made is—SPACE.—EDS.]

All men worship a Deity. To some He is an ambition, to some a fellow-human, to some the lusts of the flesh; a few—very few—offer their devotion to the old grey-beard of the stained-glass window.

It is important to distinguish between the reality and the profession. Not many of us admit—at least, in public—the existence of a graven image in our hearts. We profess to bow down before some nebulously-defined Divinity set up for us on the pedestal of our national religion. In the Church of England, for instance, we are guided by the Thirty-nine Articles to a God "without body, without passions, and without parts". As a matter of fact, our minds are early impressed by the Old Testament Scriptures which are so often read, and not by the Thirty-nine Articles which we never see. Now, the Old Testament God has body, parts, *and* passions—and very little else. In the end, influenced by an hereditary inclination to religious fear, we incline before the tribal deity, and not to the broader but vague conceptions of theology. So it is, always—the superstitious up-bringing of ignorant educators infects childhood, swamping our chances of a later influx of ideas.

To all practical intents and purposes, however, the modern man or woman is not really affected by ideas about God. Enlightened by common-sense and some scant reading, he or she rejects the current notions of religion, and says with Burton :—

There is no God, no man-made God;
A bigger, stronger, crueller man;
Black phantom of our baby-fears,
Ere Thought, the life of Life, began.

Further studies in theological history only bring about a final decision. In the words of Henri Beyle :—"La seule excuse pour Dieu est—qu'il n'existe pas."

Here, then, is the average man without a real God, adrift on the sands of Time: a solitary individual, only held, if held at all, by occasional mental reference to a scientific but undefined "First Cause".

Increasing numbers to-day, in every land, are dissatisfied with an inevitable feeling in themselves of non-completion and instability. Rightly, they turn again to examine this question of a God. Again the theologians fail them—no country but offers propaganda of an aggressive kind, monopolising the Creator: no priest but encourages devotees, like the ostrich, to bury their heads in his sand.

"Be ye Good Boys, go seek for Heaven,
"Come pay the priest that holds the key!"
So spake, and speaks, and aye shall speak
The last to enter Heaven,—he.
Are these the words for men to hear?
Yet such the Church's general tongue,
The horseleech-cry so strong, so high,
Her heavenward Psalms and Hymns among.

What now? The seeker is left with two possible means of consolation—Science and Mysticism. Fortunately, in this twentieth century, he may find a guide who is mystic and scientist in one. Both science and mysticism deal in realities, so far as our three-dimensional faculties are able to apprehend them; both abjure hypocrisy, humbug, and self-deception. It is for this reason that men like Jeans and Eddington incline more and more to the theses of the mystic schools. Among the latter, with very practical teaching for the seeker, is the Sufi School. Sir Richard Burton, whom we have already quoted, criticizes—in the light of his Sufism—those orthodox bodies that have proved a stumbling-block :—

"You all are right, you all are wrong,"
We hear the careless Sufi say,
"For each believes his glimmering lamp
"To be the gorgeous light of day.
"*Thy* faith why false, *my* faith why true?
" 'Tis all the work of Thine and Mine,
"The fond and foolish love of self
"That makes the Mine excel the Thine."
Cease then to mumble rotten bones,
And strive to clothe with flesh and blood
The skeleton; and to shape a Form
That all shall hail as fair and good.

A paradox leads to the shaping of the "Form"—it must be as form-less as our human minds can make it. The Sufi starts from the other end in conceiving his idea of God. He tries, so far as imagination will allow, to put himself in God's place. He tries to be "universal" in describing that cosmos of which he is but an insignificant part. All the fallacies of theology spring from the disastrous policy of starting from the human end. Here am I, a man! How should God be? Like *me*, of course: the king of creation—only better and greater. Alas! "better" and "greater" are *relative* words and lead to no inspiration beyond that of very human egotism, propelled by material desires. It is hard indeed to break away into Infinity from such limitations. They encourage the kind of loose thinking which stamps Mr. J. C.

Powys' much-discussed monument to Pessimism: *In Defence of Sensuality*.

Surely, it is not inconceivable that the First Cause might, by using Its free-will, have managed to reduce the pain of the world *to a kind of minimum*—just enough of it to break up the paradisic monotony!—instead of allowing the balance on the good side to be no greater than it is? Why could not the First Cause almost overcome, if not *quite* overcome, the evil in Its own nature?

Mr. Powys goes on, of course, to indulge and elaborate the notion that the Deity is helpless and that Accident plays a major part in His design. That all comes from the fact that Deity is being examined through a pair of spectacles of Mr. Powys' own making, and which are coloured by the drab tints of his own apparently accidental and helpless life.

Nothing could be less like the attitude of the Sufi. For more than a thousand years, Sufi mystics have condemned categorically all such ideas of a personal god, extra-cosmic creator of the universe. Those who hold them, have barred the way to Progress with an imaginary but dangerous gate, whose phantom height grows in ratio to the time we spend behind it. Draw a line round a goose in the farm-yard and nothing can make it step beyond. It feels it cannot, and therefore it cannot. But the line is no barrier to ward off an attack. The man-made conception of God is no "present help in time of trouble". It brings no possibility of advance in God-knowledge, with a consequent advance in power.

Imagine what may be *real* of God, and enlarge your imagining as He becomes more real. Go on doing that, guided by Nature, meditation, and esoteric practice—into infinity. Such are the Sufi precepts.

What can we imagine, that may be safely called *real*, about the Infinite One? A God, Who is worthy of the name, say the Sufis, must be boundless, omniscient, almighty. His only scripture is the book of Nature: His distinguishing feature, Harmony. There is nothing here unscientific, but we must carry our imaginings to their logical conclusion. "Boundless" suggests no limitation to anthropomorphic forms—it suggests what God is, in fact: Spirit or Essence. The Divine One of the Sufi pantheists is in all, is all. How then can He be a "man," a Being apart? The poorest reason confirms, rather, that man is in God, is part of God. So with everything and creature that is made. "Omniscient" hardly connotes "Accident," or limitation to human views in Time and Space. "Almighty" forbids the possibility of "evil" in our sense of the word—to the Sufi, Pope's maxim holds good:—"Whatever is, is Right," our blindness notwithstanding. Nature may well be unintelligible in some aspects—to *us*; but it is not chaos—that we can see. The more we examine it, the more we can at least prove its orderly, unaccidental progress; and the more the capacity for seeing Beauty grows.

Anything further comes with

time. At least a right start has been made, towards a God we may expect to grow nearer to, and Who will be ours to lose this timorous self in, in the day of trouble. To lose the *self*, to lose its limitation in Divine perfection—that is the ultimate secret of true religion. How shall we do it if God is separate, barred away by strange attributes and the vast gulfs of Space and Time?

Listen to the Sufi poet, 'Umar Khayyám':—

The idol said to the idolater, "O my servant,
Knowest thou for what reason thou hast
become mine adorer?
On me hath shone in his beauty that *one*
Who looketh forth from thee, O my
beholder!"

A long array of Sufi poets and mystics—in Persia, Arabia, India—has pleaded thus, century after century, for rational thinking on the path to God. No Eastern thinker but has been influenced by Rumi, Attar, Hafiz, Jami, Al Ghazzali, and their like. These latter would not admit for a moment that there could be reality in our separate personalities. To them their Omnipresent (and therefore "Impersonal") God was really "Omnipresent" and therefore really "all in all". The conception of actual separation never poisoned their minds at the outset.

And so, prepared by mental conceptions and religious inspiration, the Sufis have made, they say, headway in the godly life. Ah!—but have they? Across our modern brains there clangs again an echo from the *Kasidah*:—

How shall the Shown pretend to ken
Aught of the Showman or the Show?
Why meanly bargain to believe,
Which only means thou ne'er canst know?

The Sufi mystics teach, that we can transcend our limited state by virtue of that very Spirit within us which is seeking through us to experience life. For every step our understanding takes in the right direction, the Great Understanding within takes ten steps to meet us. We can refuse to remain cognisant only of the world of names and forms and of our selves. We can worship a real God. We can progress in knowledge of Him or It until we lose our fears and fancies in Compassion Absolute. The Sufi saints and Masters have proved it in their lives, and left a bulk of testimony. It is not irrational to follow in their footsteps, to try for ourselves. The only real proof of the true God is to be had, not from words but our own experience. For the only real life is the inner life.

It should never be forgotten that the Sufis owe their spiritual success to their worship of an Impersonal God, One who—because He knows nothing of nationality, jealousy, hatred, forms or names, and is in us and with us, loving and inspiring, whether we like it or not—will raise us up some day from the tomb of self.

MUMTAZ ARMSTRONG

WHERE IDEAL OF GOVERNMENT WAS REALIZED

[**Isoh Yamagata** is a joint author of *A History of Japan* and was for 15 years the Editor of *The Seoul Press*, the only English daily in Korea. Since 1924 he has occupied editorial chairs, first of *The Herald of Asia*, then of *The Young East*; latterly has served his country in the Foreign Office.

This article has a message for the India of to-day—both for the ruling class and the subject people. Also, perused in the light of the two review-articles immediately following, it brings a message for all struggling politicians and idealistic reformers.—EDS.]

I

With all its shortcomings, the feudal government of Japan under the Tokugawa Shoguns was undoubtedly one of the best the world has ever seen. Though it shut the doors of this country to the outside world and on that account checked the expansion of the Japanese race overseas, it managed to keep the country free from foreign complications and to maintain profound peace at home for nearly three centuries. In fact the whole country was so well governed that Japan was a Utopia in reality, and the people in general led a carefree and contented life. They did not know social unrest, class strife, unemployment, crime waves, menace of foreign wars, and though they had no voice in the government they were satisfied that life and property were well protected. The central government had its seat at Yedo (present Tokyo) and exercised supervision over the administration of the country carried on by some three hundred Daimyos, each of whom was the ruler of a fief assigned to him. These territorial barons had practically absolute power, but despots or tyrants were rare. On a few occasions the central government at Yedo dispossessed Daimyos of their fiefs for abuse of power. This no doubt served as a warning to the Daimyos in general and caused them to restrain themselves and encouraged them to give the people placed under their care a benevolent and paternal rule.

But there was another powerful cause which made many of them very good rulers. It was the Confucian doctrine which taught that a ruler owed it to Heaven to consider himself an agent of gods and as such to make himself an example, in the observance of virtues to the people under his care and to look after their welfare with disinterested attention, sacrificing everything for their sake, if necessary, life itself. Tokugawa Iyeyasu, founder of the Shogunate Government, and some of the successive Shoguns were great patrons of Confucianism and encouraged its study among the ruling classes, the Daimyos and Samurais. In consequence, the rulers of feudal Japan were generally men deeply imbued with the sense of ***noblesse oblige*** and rarely departed therefrom

in the discharge of their duties. On the other hand, the people at large were docile and law-abiding. In these circumstances, the relation between the ruler and the ruled was generally very intimate, the former regarding the latter as protégés and the latter looking up to the former for wisdom and guidance. In fact, in not a few places the ideal of government was realized during the feudal age. A typical instance was witnessed in the fief of Shonai in Northern Japan in the middle of last century.

II

This fief consisted of two districts with a population of 200,000 in the province of Uzen. Though generally mountainous, the two districts contained some extensive and fertile fields yielding a rich crop of rice year after year. Sakai was the family name of its hereditary Daimyo. His revenue was nominally 138,000 *koku* of rice a year, but as his fief was a very rich estate, in reality it was much greater.

Shonai was originally a rather poor estate. That it had become so well off was chiefly due to the wise administration of its successive rulers. Themselves leading a life of thrift and industry, they encouraged it among the farmers under their care, extended helping hands to those in needy circumstance, reclaimed waste lands, opened means of irrigation, lightened taxes and otherwise endeavoured to enrich them and improve their conditions. Sakai Tadanori, who was the ninth in the genealogy of his House, was particularly a wise ruler. It was his ambition to have no pauper in the region he governed and make it a land where none was too rich nor too poor. He was several times offered the position of Cabinet Minister in the central government at Yedo, but steadfastly declined to accept the proferred honour believing that his duty and mission lay in the domain under his care.

It need not be said that the grateful people of Shonai regarded their ruler with highest reverence and deepest affection. Generation after generation they had lived and prospered under the benign rule of the successive heads of the same noble family, and so a peculiar relation very different from one usually existing between ruler and ruled had sprung up between them. It was a relation similar to that existing between father and children. It had no element of bitterness, fear or antagonism.

This happiness, however, was suddenly and rudely shaken at its foundation in the latter part of 1840. Sakai Tadanori, the wise and benevolent ruler, had died some years before and been succeeded by his son. The latter was also a good man and continuing his father's policy, was as much revered and loved by his people as was his predecessor. For certain reason, he was not on good terms with Mizuno, a powerful Minister of the central government at Yedo. Mizuno was an

ambitious man. In order to curry favour with the Shogun and strengthen his influence, he concocted an intrigue to deprive Sakai of the fief of Shonai and give that rich estate to a favourite of the Shogun. With Machiavellian skill, he prevailed on his colleagues in the cabinet to support his plan and on November 1, 1840, issued in the name of the Shogun an order to Sakai transferring him from Shonai to Nagaoka in the province of Echigo.

The news that their beloved lord had been served an order of transference spread like wild fire among the people of Shonai and cast gloom over the whole region. There arose among them low murmurings, which gradually grew into voices of protest and indignation. In every village, men of any importance held assemblies to discuss ways and means for having the hateful order rescinded. In due time these assemblies developed into a great assembly of representatives from all the villages of Shonai. It was a remarkable meeting. Unlettered and rude-mannered as these representatives were, they were men of sterling character, simple, honest and earnest, and were all firmly resolved to attain their object, without much talk, they unanimously resolved, first, to pray to gods to help them, secondly, to petition to the government at Yedo to withdraw the order, thirdly, to ask for help from Daimyos of the neighbouring provinces, fourthly, to prevent if necessary even by force, the departure of Sakai for the place to which he was transferred, and fifthly, in case of failure of these measures to carry out a desperate measure.

The representatives returned to their respective villages to announce the decisions they had arrived at. Forthwith the villagers, one and all, old and young, men, women and children made it a rule to visit and pray at village shrines day by day. Many took up fasting and not a few went on a long and hard pilgrimage to great shrines in distant places.

In the meantime a number of brave men made preparations to go up to Yedo and present petitions to the advisers of the Shogun, and if necessary to the Shogun himself. This was a daring venture, for in those days a direct appeal to high dignitaries was strictly forbidden under severe penalties. Particularly a direct appeal to the Shogun was regarded as a heinous crime, any man attempting it being punished with death by crucifixion. The men new it well, but were ready to risk their lives. Nevertheless, it was no easy matter for them to start on a journey to Yedo, for the reason that lest their activities might be interpreted by the authorities at Yedo as a sign of disloyalty on his part, Lord Sakai was compelled to prevent them from carrying out their plans. He fully appreciated their motive, but had no other way than forbidding them to proceed to Yedo. Accordingly he caused all exits from Shonai to be strictly guarded.

The men, however, were not daunted. One after another they left for Yedo in secret. In the course of a few months as many as five parties of men, 77 in all, travelled to Yedo and by waylaying Ministers of the Shogun on their way to their offices presented to them petitions written in tears and blood. They also presented similar petitions to the Daimyos of the adjacent provinces asking for help. One of these petitions, which has been preserved, ran substantially as follows:—

We, representatives of the peasants of Shonai, most respectfully ask your Lordship to take cognizance of the grief into which we have been plunged by the order issued last year by the high authorities for the transference of our revered Lord Sakai. It was 220 years ago that the ancestor of our Lord came to Shonai. It was then a swampy region, yielding but a poor crop. He and his successors opened ways of drainage, reclaimed many tracts of waste land and converted the whole place into a prosperous plain. It was entirely due to their service that our forefathers and their descendants lived in peace and without want. Especially grateful are we to our present Lord, for the year before last when a severe famine visited us and we experienced great difficulty of living, his Lordship spared no pain to give relief to us. Not only did he distribute among us free rice, but gave us even salted salmons and herrings, so that we might not lack nourishing food. To those in neediest circumstances, his Lordship gave not only food but clothing. It is difficult for us to describe how deeply grateful we feel for his great favours. We have been hoping to repay even a hundredth part of his benevolence by working hard, by saving as much as we can and by paying taxes in arrears. To have to lose such a good Lord is a disaster too great for us to bear. We feel like a lonely traveller deprived of light in a dark night or a helpless baby separated from its mother. We have been praying to gods to help us in this great hour of trial. Our appeals to the high authorities at Yedo, which we presented six times through our representatives who went there in spite of our Lord's injunction and at the risk of their lives have not been answered. We are in despair. Thousands of peasants have lately been assembling at different centres, none knowing what to do, but all resolved to die if they are not allowed to retain their beloved Lord among them. We most respectfully ask your Lordship to help us.

Such sincere appeals cannot but move even the most hard-hearted of men. It is not surprising that opinion began to grow among influential Daimyos disapproving the action of Lord Mizuno. Among others, Lord Date, the powerful Daimyo of Sendai, adjoining the fief of Shonai, sent a report to the Cabinet at Yedo concerning the commotion prevailing among the peasants in Shonai. In this report, after describing the serious situation Lord Date said: "I hear that it is through no fault of his that Lord Sakai has been ordered to move out of Shonai and that there is no special reason justifying the measure."

Anxious and weary days passed, but no information came from Yedo to the peasants whether their petitions were granted or not.

Meanwhile, their representatives at Yedo continued their movement with redoubled energy and were steadily gaining sympathizers in influential quarters. The ministers of the Shogun were profoundly impressed and on July 12th 1841, an order was issued saying that ac-

cording to the desire of the Shogun Lord Sakai should remain at his post in Shonai. For fear of lowering its prestige, the Government had never revoked what it once decreed. So this was an unprecedented concession and great was the astonishment with which the people at large received it. They, however, soon learned why the Government had admitted and rectified its mistake. They were delighted and instead of going down the popularity of the authorities, went up.

It was on July 16 the news reached the peasants of Shonai by an express messenger. It was received with a tremendous outburst of joy. Many wept with joy. Too excited some could hardly walk straight and a few, running like madmen, fell into streams. Throughout the two districts of Shonai a grand festival was held, every house hanging out lanterns.

Thus the remarkable movement of the peasants of Shonai ended in their victory. Nobody claimed credit for it or sought rewards. None was the hero thereof, but all were the winners of the laurel and had no other compensation than feeling thankful. As soon as the merry-making was over, all returned to their normal course of life, to till the land, to reap the fruit of their labour and to live in peace and contentment.

III

What is the ideal of government? According to Aristotle, a good government is one in which as much as possible is left to the laws, and as little as possible to the will of the governor. We find that all the governments in the West are founded upon this principle. In the East, however, a good government was considered to be one which had as few laws as possible and which was under the direction of a wise and virtuous man. In fact it was the dream of Eastern philosophers that a law consisting of only three articles should suffice for the government of any country.

In Old Japan, this idea of government prevailed. Our forefathers had but few laws for the administration of the country, so that, before Japan opened her doors to foreign intercourse and adopted foreign institution, the two things, which were conspicuous by their absence, were, according to a British Minister, who came to this country early in the Meiji era, lawyers and bedbugs. Japan now possesses both of them in abundance, particulary the former, and we seem to be not much happier than our forefathers were. Indeed, it sometimes seems to us that Japan committed a great mistake by accepting the European method. Old Japan was a country governed not by law, but by morality, not by lawyers and politicians, but by gentlemen —nobles, samurais and scholars. Of course there were sometimes bad rulers, but on the whole rulers of Old Japan were men of high character. They considered themselves as trustees of the people's welfare, and bound, not by laws and regulations, but by the sense of moral responsibility, discharged their duties honestly and faithfully. This explains why Old Japan was so well governed and for nearly three centuries peace reigned throughout the country under the autocratic government of the Tokugawa Shoguns.

Plato's ideal of government was to place the reins of administration in the hands of a ruling class, who would do their duty with the consciousness that they are serving their country. It cannot be said that feudal lords of Old Japan were such a class of disinterested rulers, but it cannot be gainsaid that they were generally men better qualified than anybody else to come up to Plato's ideal of a governor. Typical of them were Sakais of Shonai. They proved themselves such good rulers that the people governed by them wanted them and risked their all when they were in danger of losing them. It certainly can be said that they realized to a great extent the ideal of government.

We have been told that the ideal of government is democracy. Undoubtedly it is so. But I for one prefer such an autocracy as that of Sakai to a democracy as is now practised in certain Western countries. In those countries, the so-called democracy is a rule of the majority represented by a few capable and not infrequently unprincipled men, and the minority, the class of educated and cultured men, is suffering and degenerating in consequence. It is despotism of the proletariat, and signs are many that it is as bad as, if not worse than autocracy.

A true democracy can never exist until altruism has really become the animating impulse of every individual. In other words, unless all people are imbued with the spirit of Gotama, of Confucius, of Jesus and each loves his neighbour as brother and is ready to sacrifice for the happiness of others, "the world safe for democracy" will not appear.

ISOH YAMAGATA

The individual cannot separate himself from the race, nor the race from the individual. The law of Karma applies equally to all, although all are not equally developed. In helping on the development of others, the Theosophist believes that he is not only helping them to fulfil their Karma, but that he is also, in the strictest sense, fulfilling his own. It is the development of humanity, of which both he and they are integral parts, that he has always in view, and he knows that any failure on his part to respond to the highest within him retards not only himself but all, in their progressive march. By his actions, he can make it either more difficult or more easy for humanity to attain the next higher plane of being.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Key to Theosophy*, pp. 198–9

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

CHANGING THE MIND OF THE RACE

[In increasing measure the effort is being made to bring the light of philosophy to the aid of political and social reformers. Two recent volumes examined below by two eminent critics uncover some important ideas which need further elucidation and enlightenment. We bracket them because the reviewers deal with a common problem, on which sidelight is thrown in the preceding article by our able Japanese contributor.—EDS.]

I

PLATO'S MESSAGE FOR THE MODERNS *

[**D. L. Murray** was introduced to our readers over a year ago when he wrote in these pages on "Is a New Religion Emerging?" An author and a journalist of high standing, guided by definite ideals, his suggestion in the following review deserves careful consideration by all political and social reformers.—EDS.]

Mr. Lowes Dickinson's new introduction to the philosophy of Plato, based on broadcast talks and primarily intended for those who do not know Greek, gives a fresh illustration of his remarkable gift for simple exposition. This little book is intelligible to the least instructed reader and could (we imagine) be read by the deepest Platonic scholar without any sense of "being talked down to". It is no mean feat; and Mr. Dickinson's success, we take to be due to two things, the sincerity of his thought and the beauty of his style. These are qualities that enable him to appeal at once to the plain man and the scholar, and both of them might go far before they found such an admirable account of Plato's background in the Greece of his time, or such a speaking portrait of Socrates, that gnarled and humorous old cross-examiner, who provoked the Athenians like a gadfly till they put him to death, and who was made by his disciple Plato the mouthpiece of his own profound opinions in the dialogues that Mr. Dickinson so brilliantly summarizes.

We wish to make plain at the outset our sense of the great value of this little work, because we cannot bring ourselves to agree wholly with Mr. Dickinson's estimate of the place that Plato holds, or should hold, in modern life. It is evident from the structure of Mr. Dickinson's book that he considers Plato's social and political doctrines (in the widest sense) as the part of his doctrine from which the world of to-day has most to learn, and thus the bulk of his exposition is devoted to the two great political dialogues, the *Republic* and the *Laws*.

* *Plato and his Dialogues* by G. Lowes Dickinson (George Allen & Unwin, London. 6s.)

The whole world is rocking under our feet, as was the world of Greece when Plato flourished. I speak here not only, nor chiefly, of political shocks, but of what underlies them, the overturn of ideas. Everything is now being questioned, right and wrong, religion, philosophy, marriage, property, government. So was it also in the Greece of Plato, and that is how and why he came to write as he did. There is no topic of importance which we discuss that he did not discuss too; and that, with an intelligence more profound and elevated than has often been brought to bear on such issues.

Does Mr. Dickinson here allow sufficiently for the *differences* between the civilisation in which Plato lived and our own? The city-states of Greece for which he legislated were little more than big parishes by our standard: 300 men made a formidable army, and the most urgent political and military despatches had to be carried by a man running. There were no communications save by horse or sail; no printing, no industrial machinery, no labour problem, since a slave population without rights provided for all needs. Plato could know little of geography, less of history, nothing almost that was not wrong of physics, biology or the rest of the natural sciences. To apply his ideas of government, property, marriage, eugenics to a world in size, composition and outlook so utterly different from his as our own, is not indeed necessarily fruitless, but a task demanding great circumspection. One factor in politics is no doubt constant, human psychology: and the sketches that Plato makes of the types of "democratic" "plutocratic" and "aristocratic" statesmen are as true (and even amusing) to-day as in his own time, so is his gorgeous caricature of the sophisms of "free education". But it is not really possible, we think, to learn how to solve the problems of great modern nation-states or empires from the prescriptions Plato wrote for the ailments of small city communities, living by the plough, the sailing-ship and the spear. Where, then, lies the value of Plato as a study for the modern world? Precisely, we think, in his capacicy to dive beneath the "topical" and variable elements in man and his condition to the permanent spiritual needs of the soul. It is when he is speaking, not to the ancient or the modern, not to the Greek or the barbarian, not to the agricultural or the mechanized man, but to the permanent man that his message remains of eternal validity. It is less Plato the sociologist or moralist than Plato the religious seer that our day may return to for refreshment and revelation. Says an Oxford Professor:—

> Platonism is the mood of one who has a curious eye for the endless variety of this visible and temporal world, and a fine sense of its beauties, yet is haunted by the presence of an invisible and eternal world behind, or, when the mood is most pressing, within the visible and temporal world, and sustaining both it and himself—a world not perceived as external to himself, but inwardly lived by him, as that with which in moments of ecstasy, or even habitually, he is become one.

We may not find it possible to accept, we may even be candid enough to say that we find it very hard as much as to comprehend Plato's peculiar doctrine that behind the show of visible things there stands the world of eternal ideas or forms of which the shapes we see and touch are but shadows or imperfect copies, the mystical realm in which the perfect Sea, City, Horse, Dog, Man, and the Absolute Good subsist uncontaminated by change. But it is the burden of all religious faiths that the life of man in all its vicissitudes is the working towards a spiritual ideal, the participation in a mysterious reality that we can only express by symbol and myth (such symbols and myths as Plato himself devised with supreme poetical grandeur again and again in his philosophical dialogues); and nowhere shall we find the existence of this underlying reality more persuasively and potently affirmed than in the works of Plato. After all, that reconciliation of warring Churches and creeds which is so diligently sought nowadays is most likely to be found by the recognition that each expresses in a pictorial language of its own a mysterious reality that is common to all. Plato's famous fable of the cave, in which sit fettered men judging of what passes by in the daylight outside by the reflections on the wall within which are all that they can see, is a parable of the religious knowledge of men. It is a pity that they should wrangle over these shadows instead of joining in worship of the substance, the indefinable but not wholly hidden Divine. To promote a universal agreement in religion is one of the aims of Theosophy; it finds support in the philosophy of Plato.

D. L. MURRAY

II

AN IMPRACTICAL PHILOSOPHY*

[**J. D. Beresford** finds the new book of H. G. Wells interesting, even instructive, but incapable of inspiring the average reader to change the mode of his life.

The book does not offer a stone when bread is asked; it is bread but people are unable to swallow, because they are travelling in an arid desert, are thirsty and clamour for water. Mr. Wells fails in persuading them to eat that bread with their eyes fixed on a distant oasis, which is recognized as a mirage.

If Mr. Wells would use the key of recurring cycles in history, and would impartially examine the propositions of Asiatic Psychology, he would not only find a clue as to how the return of cultures takes place through the reincarnation of those who build civilizations, ever on a rising altitude, but also the purpose and *modus operandi* of evolution.—EDS.]

* *The Work, Health and Happiness of Mankind* by H. G. Wells. (Heinemann, London. 10*s*. 6*d*. net.)

Mr. Wells's attitude to humanity is that of an anxious father, who having decided precisely the sort of sons he desires and what they shall do when they grow up, sets before them his own knowledge of life and with it his plan, conscientiously and elaborately conceived, for their development and future. Naturally he meets with opposition, but with a deliberate patience, only occasionally giving way to spasms of irritability he continues to expound and re-expound his scheme for the perfection he sees so clearly ahead of them, if they will but follow his advice. Sometimes he draws for these children of his, highly detailed and coloured pictures of the new golden age in being. At others he argues clearly and very convincingly his reasons for condemning their present way of life and for substituting the world of his desires. Or again, as in *The Outline of History*, *The Science of Life*, and now in the completion of that Trilogy with *The Work, Health and Happiness of Mankind*, he traces every stage in their growth and development, shows them where in the past they have fallen into error, praises them for their present achievements, and finally demonstrates that their evolution having followed the lines he has traced, they must ultimately become that which he has already foreseen, so why will they not accept his prescription and thus hasten the coming of the New Era of satisfaction and content.

In these addresses to humanity at large, Mr. Wells, although he exhibits now and again, as he must, the detachment of the historian or the scientist in his general view of our evolution and development, does not stand superciliously apart from his kind in the manner of his great contemporary, Bernard Shaw. It is not Wells's method, despite his biological training, to dissect and exhibit his specimens so that we may wonder at his technical ability and be startled by our recognition of the vividness with which these displayed subjects depict the living type. He is too sympathetic, too generous, too paternal to do no more than caricature our weaknesses, and leave us with a faint sneer of contempt because we are such awkward, ugly, unintelligent creatures. Also, his optimism has that ideal quality which can never admit defeat. At the age of 65, he comes again to his review of the world and his plans for its future, with a zest, a clear sightedness and, perhaps most remarkably an ability for dramatic and vivid literary expression, that shows no mark of decline. So far from being disheartened by the reluctance of mankind to put his gospel into practice, he is, apparently, more hopeful now than he has ever been.

The work now under review follows the same plan as that of the two volumes that preceded it in the series, but the subject of this final instalment is in a sense a summary of the whole enquiry. Here, following still the synoptical

method whenever practicable, Mr. Wells has treated the inception and progress of a host of human activities. He shows us how man first became an "economic animal" by the accretion of property, beginning with such portable possessions as a skin or a flint tool, and ending with flocks and tillable land that presently necessitated the organising of the community and then in some dim, unrecorded epoch to the founding of the city, and the principle of exchange and barter. He has indicated the genesis of logical thought, the forsaking of the child-process of thinking in pictures under the direction of fantasy for the constructive reasoning of the philosopher and the scientist. He has given us some kind of conspectus of economic developments of the coming of machinery, of the growth and present condition of trade. There are chapters on sociology, the position of women, government, the distribution of population, education, war, in short, with one exception, on all the diverse activities, interactions and energies that we recognise as elements in the political, economic and social world of the present day. And all of them are treated with the same insight, and the same brilliant gift for logical thought and exposition.

We may, indeed, very well pause at this point, to ponder the exceedingly interesting problem of why the world at large should be so obtuse as not to follow Mr. Wells's counsel, at least to the extent of enthusiastically supporting his creed and policy? It is easy to account for the refusal of the wealthy—they have too much to lose. But the wealthy are, numerically, a negligible fraction of the world's population. What of the others, the great mass of the people educated, half-educated and illiterate? They must surely recognise that the way of Mr. Wells is the way of common sense towards those cities of content to be built by the good-will of mankind on the ground of common interest and mutual understanding? Two million copies of *The Outline of History* have been sold in various editions and languages; and it is still selling. Is not this an indication that the thought of the world is turning however turgidly into the course that Mr. Wells has so strenuously and persistently shaped? If not, can we find any reason for his relative failure? Is it possible, for instance, that he has made some extraordinary error in his deduction from those facts which so far as human knowledge can be sure of anything, are the accepted data of the educated man? Or has he omitted some vital factor, some necessary constant in his immense equation? Yet he claims that these three works represent "*all current human activities and motives—all and nothing less*".

Now, if all the statements Mr. Wells has ever made, surely this that we have just quoted, is the most astounding, for in the work under review there is only the

most casual reference to religion. It is true that in *The Outline of History* the influence of religion —were it only as a fruitful cause for dissension, or wars, or as a stumbling-block in the path of science,—could not be so slightingly dismissed; but even there it was treated not as a great energising motive but rather as a passing phase of ignorant superstition. Yet out of the world's estimated population of nineteen hundred million people, how many are there who do not profess religion of some sort or another? And can we regard the influence of say, Confucianism, Buddhism, Christianity and Moslemism as a negligible influence on the world's thought and action at the present day, and one that will ultimately fade in the light of the new age of reason.

These are questions that make one demand in sheer bewilderment if Mr. Wells's early training has blinded him to this aspect of human development. He writes:—

> We contemporary human beings, are taught so much from our earliest years . . . that a multitude of ideas seem to us to be in the very nature of things, whereas it is merely that at a very early stage they have been built into the fabric of our minds.

Can we infer then, from his own statement that his reaction from orthodoxy, his work at the College of Science and his subsequent development have so far ousted the idea of religion from his mind that it seems to him to be outside "the very nature of things"? Before attempting to answer that question, however, let us quote a later passage from the work before us, in which Mr. Wells writes:—

> It is impossible to dismiss mystery from life. Being is altogether mysterious. Mystery is all about us and in us, the Inconceivable permeates us, it is "closer than breathing, nearer than hands and feet". For all we know, that which we are may rise at death from living, as an intent player wakes up from his absorption when a game comes to an end, or as a spectator turns his eyes from the stage as the curtain falls, to look at the auditorium he has for a long time forgotten. These are pretty metaphors, that have nothing to do with the game or the drama of space and time. Ultimately the mystery may be the only thing that matters, but *within the rules and limits of the game of life*, when you are catching trains or paying bills or earning a living, the mystery does not matter at all.

It is evident, therefore, that Mr. Wells is not blind in this particular connection, but only, and so strangely, for him, illogical. He postulates that ultimately this mystery may be the only thing that matters, but decides that in the common affairs of life it plays no part. And having made that decision he looks the other way whenever religion is likely to obtrude itself on his notice, and says "No, in this book we are dealing with practical things on the surface of the earth. . . . We deal with the daily life of human beings now and in the ages immediately ahead. We remain in the space and time of ordinary experience . . . at an infinite distance from ultimate truth".

It is no longer necessary, therefore, to ponder that problem of

why the world at large does not accept Mr. Wells's prescriptions with a greater enthusiasm. His forecasts may be true, his judgments of present conditions inoppugnable but what has he to offer that man of his instance, who is catching trains, paying bills and earning a living? The prospect of a happier future that he will never see. The credit of having done something to make the world better for a new race that he will never know. But however magnificent in its self-effacing altruism may be this modern version of Positivism, it is not a bait to entice the average man and woman. They may well answer him as he has answered those who assert that his "mystery" is the reality and his facts but passing aspects of illusion, by saying, "We also, are dealing with the practical things on the surface of the earth, and have neither time nor inclination to consider the distant future".

And, strangely enough, it is to those who believe in the "mystery" as the essential stimulus of life and action, to whom this vision of a building for the ages to come, will make the true appeal. If a man had no religion, —though indeed all men above the very lowest grade of primitive intelligence have some intimation of the eternal principle within them—he would have no incentive to work for the good of anyone but himself. On the other hand, as he develops in self-knowledge and consciousness, becoming increasingly more aware of himself in relation to the world and the eternal purpose, his sense of responsibility continually expands. Without this light, however flickeringly and uncertainly it may shine behind the vapours of misunderstanding that obscure those four chief religions of the world instanced above, life would have no meaning, no object worth achieving. If evolution and development have no aim beyond a perfected materialism that must ultimately perish with the dying sun, we may well deny our belief in them, or rather regard them as a passing phase in the broad curve beyond our plotting, a phase that will presently pass the crest and decline into an undoing of that which has been uselessly done.

Nevertheless, this trilogy of Mr. Wells's, if it omits the one essential that would give it a permanent validity, is an intensely interesting commentary on the civilisation of the past six thousand years. We may smile at the author's naïf belief in machinery as the instrument of our social salvation, question his belief that the spirit of man will quicken to the call of a duty imposed solely by a hope for the welfare of a world we shall not live to enjoy. But if we read with a free mind the records he has so indefatigably gathered, we shall find that they are capable of another interpretation, that the tiny period of evolution he has covered is notable less for its scientific and mechanical achievements than for the evidence it displays of an increasing humanitarianism, of an extension of individual and national consciousness, and of a spiritual development that will finally control all the activities of the world.

J. D. BERESFORD

The Elephant-Lore of the Hindus. Translated from the original Sanskrit with Introduction, Notes and Glossary, by FRANKLIN EDGERTON. (Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut and Oxford University Press, London. $ 2)

Professor Edgerton, by his scholarly translation of the *Mātaṅga-līlā* or "Elephant-Sport" of Nīlakaṇṭha has filled a gap that has long been conspicuous in the shelves of Western libraries. He has greatly enhanced the value of his work by the long explanatory introduction, and the references to parallel passages in other Sanskrit treatises on elephantology that serve to elucidate some of the obscurities of the text. The paucity of available literature in the English language on this important subject is really inexplicable in view of the prominent position the great beasts have occupied in India from very early times, and we are grateful that Professor Edgerton did not permit the existence of Zimmer's German translation to deter him from supplying an English version.

The Hindus regarded elephantology as a branch of the *Arthaśāstra*, the science of government, and it is instructive to note that the earliest Indian treatise on statecraft, the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* which is variously dated from *ca.* 300 B.C. to *ca.* 300 A.D., includes the oldest data we have on the subject, since when elephantology has never been excluded in any Hindu work on political science. The known texts unanimously attribute the founding of elephant-lore on a scientific basis to a mythical sage Pālakāpya, whose supernatural birth is described in the stanzas of the Mātaṅga-līlā. They also agree in making him reveal this knowledge first to an apparently mythical king, Romapāda of Aṅga. Professor Edgerton remarks that the three elephant books known to him are all composed in the form of dialogues between these two personages. This repetition seems to make it clear that the mythic origin of elephants and of the sage Pālakāpya were part of the standard tradition.

It is a pure joy to read, even in translation, the poem of Nīlakaṇṭha. We are mentally transported to the Golden Age when the gods walked and talked with men, when, as *The Secret Doctrine* teaches, "'Inventors' were Gods and demi-gods (Devas and Rishis) who had become—some deliberately, some forced to by Karma—incarnated in man". (II, 373, foot-note.)

Pālakāpya "played with the elephants, their cows, and the young elephants, roaming with them through rivers and torrents, on mountain tops and in pools of water, and on pleasant spots of ground, living as a hermit on leaves and water, through years numbering twice six thousand, learning all about the elephants, what they should and should not eat, their joys and griefs, their gestures and so forth." (p. 46)

No wonder Pālakāpya could speak with authority on the subject! His work is extraordinarily inclusive, and ranges from the "caste" of elephants to "their daily and seasonal regiment," whilst a special chapter deals with the interesting pathological phenomenon peculiar to these great beasts known as "the state of *must*".

Finally, having portrayed all stages of the elephant's life from birth to death Pālakāpya says: "Thus, O king, having reached a hundred and twenty years, and having performed many kinds of work, the elephant goes to heaven."

M. OLDFIELD HOWEY

[Our reviewer is the author of *Horse in Magic and Myth, The Encircled Serpent, The Cat in the Mysteries of Religion and Magic.* —EDS.]

Etapes. By M. DUGARD (Éditions "Je Sers," Paris. 18 fcs.)

Readers of THE ARYAN PATH will recognize the name of the author of *Stepping Stones*. Mademoiselle Dugard was a frequent contributor to its pages, and in her death the journal loses a valued friend and sympathiser, one to whom the Theosophical ideal of Universal Brotherhood was a living reality. The Volume was all but ready at the close of 1931, but it fell to the lot of her editors to send it out to the world early in 1932 and they do it thus :—

From the Editors
This Book in which
MARIE DUGARD
1862—1931
Saw the culmination of her Labours and which constitutes her Spiritual Will and Testament.

A thought of Pascal reveals the purpose of the book and enlivens its titles : "The whole human race, throughout the succession of centuries, may be considered as one man,—ever living and continually learning."

Was Pascal intuitively feeling the fact of Reincarnation ?

The stepping-stones of human progress are described in nine sections of the book, each with a suggestive title ; each of them pertains to a definite period of European history. The slow unfoldment of unselfishness is traced, and progress is measured by spiritual values, not in terms of material comforts. The essential function of a civilization is "to create such conditions of life as will help man to kill the savage in him, and to realize himself as man". Our present problems are spiritual and must be solved through a religious ideal, for "man is a religious animal ; do away with his religious life, and the animal alone will be left, and it is far from being beautiful." But religion is not sectarianism, or theological dogmatism ; it is the force which unites a man to his fellows, enables him to sanctify all the duties and obligations of life, and prompts him to greater spiritual achievements. This is Marie Dugard's philosophy, and those who knew her personally know full well that she taught it by example as well as by precept.

The author paints a series of word-pictures in which human characters act out their parts and speak their lives, against an actual historical background ; we are made to live over again the historical events which shaped the destiny of Europe. The characters are not heroes of those events, but they reflect in the routine of their lives the spirit of the age to which they belong. These also reveal the friendliness, the kind sense of humour, the delightful human touch, and intimacy with humanity so characteristic of Marie Dugard. Her pictorial method and her style hold the attention of the reader and many will absorb the serious thoughts of *Etapes* who would never touch a volume of essays, historical or philosophical. Further, the book brings out most effectively the silent parts played by common humble folk in the building of nations and the moulding of civilizations.

The reader is gently awakened to a sense of his own responsibility. This awakening is in preparation for the assimilation of the author's message so forcefully delivered in the last section —"Au Large". The writer maintains her impersonality in these stirring pages, and yet the reader strongly feels her earnestness and sincerity. That we read that message after the death of Mademoiselle Dugard adds to its impressiveness. "At High Sea" pictures our day : On a transatlantic liner from New York to Liverpool, a European, an American, a Hindu are interviewed by a journalist from the United States ; a young Frenchman sums up the discussions and the views, bringing out their merits and messages. The failings of European, American, and Indian civilizations are sternly condemned, and in suggesting remedies the first task is—give up pride, individual and national, and develop the strength of dispassionate self-criticism.

To recognize our weaknesses—that is the first step. Each nation must develop along the line of its own inherent genius, and each must make its contribution to the progress of the race as a whole, for interdependence is the basis of life itself. India has a message for the West, but so has the West for India. In mutually helping each other, both will eliminate the evils of their own civilizations and strengthen the good of their own cultures.

The last section sums up the whole book and brings out the spiritual Ideal which inspired Marie Dugard. The closing touch is fine. With a quotation from Victor Hugo she glimpses the grandeur of the future :—

Already, love in the obscure era
Which is coming to an end
Traces the vague outline
Of the Future.

In order that this "already" may not be too premature it is necessary for each one to begin, on this very day to love his fellow as himself.

Quo Vadis ? Humanity, embarked on the Ocean of Life, thou knowest it not..... But whatever the winds and the storms which seem to threaten the ships, fear not : the master is aboard and "the spirit of God moveth on the Waters."

C.

The Legacy of Islam. Edited, by the late Sir THOMAS ARNOLD and ALFRED GUILLAUME. (Oxford University Press, London. 10*s*.)

The Legacy of Islam describes the contribution of the Arabs to arts, sciences, and literature, and is therefore essentially a cultural history of the Arabs. The time covered is from the rise of Islam to the fall of the caliphate of Baghdad ; the extent in space is from Spain and Portugal to Central Asia ; and the legacy bequeathed is generally the learning of the Greeks preserved in Arabic translations and, to a smaller extent, original contributions where the Arabs supplemented and improved upon Greek thought. A work, therefore, so extensive in time, space, and subject-matter runs the risk of becoming superficial, but the *Legacy of Islam* is not superficial. Each chapter has been written by an expert : Spain and Portugal, by J. B. Trend ; the Crusades, by Ernest Barker ; Geography and Commerce, by J. H. Kramers ; Islamic minor arts and their influence upon European work, by A. H. Christie ; Painting, by the late Sir Thomas Arnold ; Architecture, by Martin S. Briggs ; Literature, by H. A. R. Gibb ; Mysticism, by R. A. Nicholson ; Philosophy and Theology, by Alfred Guillaume ; Law and Society, by David de Santillana ; Science and Medicine, by Max Meyerhof ; Music, by H. G. Farmer ; and Astronomy and Mathematics, by Carra de Vaux : and the combined result is a first-rate production, which bears the impress of authority and which presents in one volume and in excellent English almost the whole range of Islamic studies.

In the Middle Ages, Arabs were the transmitters of learning to Europe : the translation school of al-Ma'mūn and al-Mutawakkil at Baghdad was the envy of scholars, and Cordoba, with its 70 libraries and 900 public baths, was the most civilized city in Europe. Avicenna, al-Farābī, and Algazel introduced Aristotle to Europe ; the Muslim philosopher and physicist al-Kindī (d. 873) produced no less than 265 works ; and the Christian physician Hunayn (d. 877) translated the whole immense corpus of Galenic writings. Several books of Galen, 3 books of the *Conics* of Apollonius, the *Spherics* of Menelaus, the *Mechanics* of Hero of Alexandria, the *Pneumatics* of Philo of Byzantium, the *balance* of Euclid, the *clepsydra* of Archimedes—these are amongst the Greek writings whose originals are lost and whose preservation is due entirely to their Arabic translations.

More interesting, however, are the original contributions of the Arabs. In mathematics, the Arabs taught the use of ciphers (Ar. *Sifr*, empty), developed algebra (Ar. *al-jabr*, restitution), improved analytical geometry, and founded plane and spherical trigonometry. The formulæ $\sin\alpha = \frac{\tan\alpha}{\sqrt{(1+\tan^2\alpha)}}$; $\cos\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1+\tan^2\alpha)}}$ of al-Battānī and

$$\sin\ (a+b)=\frac{\sin a \cos b+\sin b \cos a}{R}$$

of Abu'l-Wafā, the cubic equations of 'Umar Khayyām, the solution by al-Qūhī of an unproved lemma of Archimedes, the invention (in arithmetic) of the proof "by casting out the nines," the rule of the double false position, the perfection, (in astronomy) of the sphere of Ptolemy, and the rule (in plane and spherical trigonometry) of the supplementary figure of Nasīru'd-Dīn Tūsī are positive additions to mathematical thought. In science, Abū Rayḥān al-Bīrūnī (d. 1048) determined almost exactly the specific weight of 18 precious stones and metals; Jābir (10th century), the father of alchemy (Ar. al-Kīmiyā), improved methods for evaporation, filtration, crystallization, sublimation etc., prepared cinnabar, arsenious oxide, crude sulphuric and nitric acids, etc., and bequeathed to the modern chemist words like realgar, alkali, antimony, tutia, alembic and aludel. But "the glory of Muslim science is in the field of optics: here the mathematical ability of an Alhazen (Abu 'Alī al-Ḥasan ibn al-Haytham of Baṣra, c. 965, the discoverer of Alhazen's problem and of camera obscura) and a Kamālu'd-Din (d. 1320) outshone that of Euclid and Potlemy".

In architecture, the pointed arch and the ogee arch, cusps and cusped arches, engaged shafts at the angles of piers, ornamental and pierced battlements, inscriptions in Kufic characters, striped façades, arabesques and the use of geometrical patterns are specific instances of the indebtedness of Europe to Islam, whilst in music, the words lute (Ar. al-'ūd), rebec (Ar. rabāb), guitar (Ar. qitāra), naker (Ar. naqqāra, hocket (Ar. iqā'āt, rhythm), elmuahyn and elmuarifa are purely Arabian, as is also mensural music which has been described in a work by al-Kindī (d. 873). Al-Farābī's *Grand book on Music* was written to fill gaps in the musical knowledge of the Greeks, and the use of the Major 7th of the scale as a leading note to the tonic, and experiments in the spherical propagation of sound and with the neutral third of Zalzal $\frac{27}{22}$ and the Persian third $\frac{81}{68}$ come also under the same category.

In medicine, the first clear knowledge of small-pox and measles was propounded by Rhazes (al-Rāzī, d. 925) in his treatise on these subjects; Greek knowledge of opthalmology was increased by the Christian Jesu Haly ('Alī ibn 'Īsa) of Baghdad and the Muslim Canamusali ('Ammār) of mosul whose treatises on eye-diseases, composed about 1000 A.D., remained standard-works as late as 1750 A.D.; and the infectious character of plague was first discussed by Ibn al-Khaṭīb (d. 1374) in his treatise on the plague. The great reputation of Avicenna (Abū 'Alī al-Ḥusayn ibn Sīnā d. 1037) and Averroes (Ibn Rushd d. 1198) rests not on original discoveries but on their marvellous systematization of medical knowledge displayed in the *Canon* and the *Colliget* respectively.

In commerce and economics, Europe has inherited from the Arabs the conception of the joint-stock company (which arose from the partnership of Muslim and Italian merchants), the institution of limited partnership (qirād), and words like muslin (from Mosul), damask (from Damascus), baldachin (a stuff made in Baghdad), gauze, cotton, satin, traffic (Ar. tafrīq), tariff (Ar. ta'rīf) magazine (Ar. makhāzīn), cheque, calibre, risk, tare, mohatra, douane, aval, etc. In Spain and Portugal, naturally, the reflex-effect of Arab culture and dominance has been far greater: there is a whole vocabulary of hybrid words of Moorish—Spanish origin.

Elsewhere too in philosophy, mysticism, and literature the influence of Islam on European thought is not wanting. *The Legacy of Islam* is a fascinating book, rich in facts and detail, and full of information both literary and scientific.

HĀDĪ ḤASAN

Talks with Spirit Friends, Bench and Bar. Being descriptions of the next World and its activities by well-known persons who live there, given through the trance mediumship of the late Miss Sara Harris to a Retired Public Servant. (John M.Watkins, London. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

The nature of this book is indicated by its title. It is dreary, for the "well-known persons," who are said to be responsible for the bulk of its contents, appear to have lost in the process of dying all the wit and wisdom, which belonged to some of them at least while in the flesh.

Several of them, when alive, were famous English jurists, pre-eminently skilled in the art of stating a case with accuracy and eloquence, and expert in marshalling and weighing evidence; but their ghosts are prosy, mediocre, and utterly unconvincing. The descriptions they give of the "Summerland" read rather like the advertisements of a speculative builder booming the merits of some suburban estate. They tell us about the "cities, towns and undulating countries" of the after-death world; of its "boroughs and municipalities, and all the paraphernalia to instil knowledge"; of "well-paved streets, broad thoroughfares, stately houses and magnificent scenery"; of a post-mortem "sanatorium," where "stringed music" is "mingled with sways of branches and singing of beautifully coloured birds," and nurses are "flitting here and there with cordials and fruits"; the beds, usual in mundane hospitals, being replaced by "silken hammocks" with silver supports!

One famous judge tells us that he is now engaged as "a sort of administrator over a certain territory"; a learned counsel has "been appointed senior master of an academy"; a once noted admiral still raves at the folly of "damned land-lubbers"; another learned counsel, famous for his wit while living, makes frequent feeble attempts to crack jokes from behind the veil, but death has rubbed all the edge off his humour. This kind of thing goes wearily on through 226 closely printed demy octavo pages.

Needless to say that all the communicators have much to tell us about the benevolence of the personal god who is supposed to have designed this delectable other-world of theirs.

That this extremely unspiritual twaddle can find readers who take it seriously, is a striking proof of the crass materialism of the people to whom it appeals. We would like to think that they are not typical of the spiritualist body as a whole.

R. A. V. M.

Kandan the Patriot. By K. S. VENKATARAMANI (Svetaranya Ashrama, Mylapore, Madras. Rs. 2.)

The reader finds much food for thought in this book, which presents with startling clearness, the picture of a great country faced with the disaster of betrayal at the hands of her own sons. The action centres chiefly around a group of young people who have spent some years studying at Oxford. On returning to India, several bend all their energies toward helping their native land, but others, tainted with the fever of power and ambition, have thought of nothing but personal advancement. At the strategic moment, however, they awaken to the realization of their responsibility, and from that time on they are willing to sacrifice everything, even life if need be.

Such is the unusual picture given to the world by one who knows and deplores the present conditions of his country. The author points out, how even the politics of the country need undergo a change. He makes the reader feel the tremendous importance of the duty centred in each individual, a true definition of which cannot be better expressed than in the words of Madame Blavatsky, (*The Key to Theosophy*, p. 192, Indian Edition) when she say that "Duty is that which *is due* to Humanity, to our fellowmen, neighbours, family, and especially that which we owe to all those who are

poorer and more helpless than we are ourselves".

The book is timely, and comes at a critical period in the history of India though it is in no wise partisan. The reform on which it lays stress is that which comes from within—the awakening of each individual to his own responsibility. Once again we are reminded of *The Key to Theosophy*, (p. 194) by Madame Blavatsky where she says so truly :—

> To seek to achieve political reforms before we have effected a reform *in human nature, is like putting new wine into old bottles.* Make men feel and recognize in their innermost hearts what is their real, true duty to all men, and every old abuse of power . . . . will disappear.

P. F.

Experiences Facing Death. By MARY AUSTIN (Rider and Co., London. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

Miss Austin has given us an interesting and suggestive, but withal somewhat disappointing book. She sets out "to study. . . .the movement of experience as we go toward death"; and to show what light is thrown on the problems of death and survival by the psychic and spiritual experience of mankind. The work is of value, because it records the inner adventures of a gifted and thoughtful woman, and contains many illuminating observations by the way. It is, however, incoherent in method, and achieves no very definite result. Miss Austin is rather like one who knows all there is to know about a labyrinth except the secret way to the centre. As a guide, she leads us round and round, and finally "out by the same door as in we went".

Over and over again, when reading the book, we light upon a brilliantly intuitive passage, and seem to be on the brink of some vital discovery, only to be switched off suddenly to another topic.

Miss Austin's own religious experiences have been wide and varied. She has practised the rites of the Indian tribes, among whom she lived in Mexico; she has gone through the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola under a Jesuit director; and has learned Yoga practices from a Swami. She has "made her soul" by listening to the "Pyrrhic rhythms of the Medicine Drum," and by undergoing the expiation rituals of the Catholic *Hermanos Penitentes*. She has also studied modern psychology. But, in her search for enlightenment, Miss Austin seems to have neglected the chief source of light. *Ex Oriente Lux*, says the proverb; but she has turned away from the spiritual East, to focus her gaze on dimmer lamps elsewhere. To reincarnation, she devotes only a few lines, setting it aside for further evidence. To Karma she refers not at all.

Her quest for information about death and its sequel in the mental life of the living would have been more fruitful, had Miss Austin started out with some knowledge of the psychology of the great religions of the East, which explains what in us is eternal, what temporal. She is convinced of our "everlastingness," but is vague as to what in us is everlasting.

Everlastingness implies pre-existence. That one is born on the blank day of blank, and will live eternally, is unthinkable. If death be but a portal, then so is birth; and we may form some notion of what the real self takes out with him through the gate of death by considering what he brings in with him through the gate of birth. If he enters life equipped with tendencies, affinities, character; may we not assume that he carries these with him when he leaves it? Personal memory he neither brings nor takes; for memory survives only as character, which is its quintessence.

There are many passages in the book which are epigrammatic and quotable.

R. A. V. M.

Hypnotism: Black Magic In Science. By H. P. BLAVATSKY. U. L. T. Pamphlet, No. 19. [Theosophy Company (India) Ltd., Bombay.]

This pamphlet is one of those later editorial articles in *Lucifer* in which Mme. Blavastky gave some details and hints concerning the rationale of the "secret arts" and explained the dangers inherent in their practice. Interest in hypnotism was then epidemic in Europe and America: it has since become endemic and assumed many forms.

In this article a bird's-eye view is given of the history of magnetic healing from ancient times down to 1890 when Charcot and his school flourished and Braid had invented the word "hypnotism" to disconnect the "new" discovery from the work of the academically discredited Mesmer and his followers. Mme. Blavatsky points out that these amateur "hypnotists" of science were trying to use the laws of an ancient science which they did not understand; and, therefore, they were unconscious of the disastrous consequences of these practices known then and since to many physicians.

Official science turned a blind eye on the random experiments, in a dangerous field of science, undertaken by novices —men of science as well as "laymen"— without theorems to guide them or teachers to instruct them. It overlooked the rule of honour, observed within its own societies, which acknowledges the priority of an experimental demonstration and publication of facts. If it had recognised this, inquiry might have been turned on the *principles* behind the facts of "Mesmerism" and "hypnotism" that had been repeatedly recorded in previous centuries and at that time by du Potet and others. But, as science does not admit officially that Will is an energy which sets other energies in motion, nothing was done to restrict experiments with this penetrating power to those properly qualified by character, motive and discipline.

On the positive side science has foolishly maintained that the "Animal Magnetism" of Paracelsus, Kircher, Mesmer and other magnetic healers is a chimera; for the assertion that there is only one kind of magnetism—the electro-magnetism of physics—has at last been disproved by biologists who now describe biological states in terms of electro-magnetic "systems"; although it is not yet known how the various systems of an organism are synthesized or polarized.

Hypnotists and psycho-analysts are still permitted in the name of science to *vivisect* or *depolarize* human beings, to "unseal" what the alchemists sought to "seal" and heal; because it is not realized how these experiments break the magnetic insulation of the subject and so induce psycho-physiological and moral disintegration. However, Mme. Blavatsky's explanation in this article regarding the "active living germs of mental and physical ills" that invade a hypnotized subject, ought to be understood to-day in view of recent discoveries that many diseases are transmitted by "invisible, ultra-microscopic agencies of an entirely different order from microbes".

W. W. L.

Kabir and His Followers. By the REV. F. E. KEAY, D. LITT. (Association Press, Calcutta. Oxford University Press, London. 5*s.*)

An emaciated little old man sits under the cool shade of a mango-grove working at his loom, his frail olive body glowing almost red with the warmth of the torrid Sun. From under the thin muslin cap a plain surface of grey white hair declines on his temples to define the expression of his face as the index of a soul which has battled against and been beaten out by the world, though exalted by God to saintliness. A disciple sits on his right; on his left a musician is straining the chords of a lute. The saint of God, the weaver's shuttle in his hands, is arrested in a dumb ecstasy by the very music of his own song.

Dr. Keay reproduces as *frontispiece* this picture of Kabir painted by a 17th century Moghal artist. Thereby unfortunately the author puts his own portrait of the reformer to rather unflattering comparisons. For, while the masterly brush of the Moghal painter has evoked the spirit of Kabir Dr. Keay has statistically mounted fact upon fact in certain dry-as-dust chapters on Kabir and some of his followers, unilluminated by any charm of narrative and devoid even of the saving grace of dialectical subtlety. Still facts about a man so surrounded by fiction as Kabir are welcome, specially as Dr. Keay has often collected them by first hand inspection of the various places connected with the life of Kabir and by original researches into the literature of the Kabir Panth, and they supply excellent material from which the creative imagination of any interested reader may draw a suitable picture.

Kabir was born about the early half of the fifteenth century to a Muhammadan weaver named Niru and his wife Nima at the holy city of Benares. It was an extremely disturbed era: Hinduism and Islam were at loggerheads and concentrated on flaunting their respective dogmas against each other while their own houses were far from being in order. The sensitive child was dazed as much by the fanaticism and bigotry with which his co-religionists butchered the Hindus and destroyed their shrines as by the wanton brutality by which the Brahmins treated the lower castes, condemning one fourth of humanity to the living death of untouchability. He had heard the doctrines of the Sufis from his parents and found them not to be very different in spirit from the tenets of devotional Hinduism which were then being preached by Ramananda, the great Vaishnava reformer. He became a disciple of the Hindu sage and after the master's death himself began to preach a mixture of Hinduism and Islam. One of the earliest thoughts he is said to have uttered is significant of this attitude:

O holy men! I have seen the way of both,
Hindus and Turks heed no warning; to all the taste of their desires is sweet.
Says Kabir, Listen, O holy men: cry 'Rama'; cry 'Khuda'; it is all one!

His mature thought contains a wealth of very pungent yet refined verse criticism of priest-ridden Hinduism and intolerant Islam for which we must be grateful, not only because it brought a new message of hope to the age in which it found utterance but because it has a peculiar relevancy to our own century steeped in the same bloody rivalries which Kabir sought to placate. Our gratitude is the more intense when we realise that most of what Kabir taught, he acutely suffered for. Sikandar Lodi, the Pathan King, tortured him with unspeakable cruelty for proclaiming so beautiful a truth as this:

For him who sows thorns for thee, do thou sow flowers.
For thee the harvest will be flowers; but for him sharp pains.

The Brahmins whose parrot-like repetition of the holy *mantras* had evoked Kabir's censure, cast upon him the stigma of being a low-caste weaver, but he responded—

Thou art a Brahmin, I am a weaver of Benares; how can I be a match for thee?
By repeating the name of God I may be saved; while thou, O Pandit, shall be lost for trusting the words of the *Veda*.

The pedantry of the priestly versions of the *Upanishads* and the flowery verbiage of post-classical Pauranic literature frightened him, although he accepted the *Upanishadic* doctrines of *Karma* (law of action and reaction) and *Samsara* (universe), the initiation of a disciple through the Divine Word by the *Guru* (Master), etc., he never made any very serious attempt to evolve a coherent system of theology or metaphysics. There is in his recorded sayings about God a persistent flaw. Now his God possesses all the attributes of a person to be worshipped with love and devotion: and then He becomes the pantheistic, abstract, quality-less Absolute,

Kabir's legacy to posterity would not have been anything but a strange motley of Hindu and Muhammadan habiliments had it not been that he was blessed with an extraordinary gift for music and song. He would go about singing his exquisitely melodious harmonies: he would answer people's inquiries in verse, he would refute the arguments of his adversaries in a subtle rhyme, he would sermonise by singing a song, and the music of his verse and the doctrines of his belief would steal into people's hearts before they knew they had been converted.

The result is that though he never sought to found a sect, we see to-day, according to Dr. Keay, some millions of the people of India divided into twelve or even more, strong sects, which seek inspiration from Kabir's many different and often inconsistent social and religious ideals; and though he made no pretensions to learning (and was, indeed, often crude in his grammar and diction) "his words can," on the authority of so eminent a linguist as Sir George Grierson, "still be heard in every village of Hindustan".

MULK RAJ ANAND

Religion, Morals and the Intellect. By F. E. POLLARD. (George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London. 5*s.*)

Mr. Pollard, treading his way through the perplexities of life and thought, defends Reason as a reliable guide to the most significant truth for men. The present tendency to relegate the intellect to a subordinate position, he thinks, is due partly to its rejection of particular beliefs which have held sway over the religious mind of the past; partly to fear of the consequences of thought and partly to an inherent and vitiating departmentalism. But reason, the author holds, is the human spirit seeking reality; it is "the impulse to harmonize and unify". Since the mind of man is "the power which collects and classifies phenomena, gives form and system to the medley of impressions, constructs purposes and weighs values," Mr. Pollard contends that it can be of great service to human activity and progress. In the cause of religion and conduct, he maintains, the intellect must defend a truly spiritual religion. In other words, it should carry on an incessant warfare against the insidious relics of magic and superstition which abound, and against the present bewildering tendency to devise and follow new forms of sorcery, unreason and all the unmeaning irrelevancies of the occult.

Strange as it may seem, it is not the wonders of science that appeal to the common mass but the wonders of unreason. Since a world of tricks, where none can trace the how and why, is preferred to one of ordered purpose, our author's thesis is that the combating of this tendency,—the tendency to bow to the power of authority without personal conviction,—is an important part reason could play in meeting the needs of to-day. This attitude is Theosophical.

In the second place, Mr. Pollard contends that in the working out of a sound psychology which, while making full use of the added modern understanding of instinct, self-activity, suggestion, sublimation and the distortions due to unremembered shocks and strains, will reassert the unity of the mind's life and reinstate ideals and conscious purposes in their supreme place as the growing points of the spirit of man, the intellect can render a real service to humanity. Further, the author maintains that the intellect must be of help in leading men generally to a belief in the reality and power in the unseen world. The most serious opposition to his ideas on this matter will come, as the author is aware, from those who maintain the imaginative nature of religion which inevitably personifies or presents ideal distinctions in the guise of concrete objects. Nevertheless, the author is absolutely right in his firm stand that the mind should not be in bondage to its images,—and idolatry takes many

forms,—but make them the servants of a deeper and more fruitful understanding. Lastly, he maintains that the intellect should help in the rehabilitation of morality, and the replacement of its undetermined and crumbled basis of authority by an intrinsic, natural and rational foundation.

The burden of Mr. Pollard's message is that man has infinite possibilities of effort and intelligence; the more we emphasize the understanding side of man's nature, the more we trust his intelligence, the more fully will it rise to heights otherwise impossible. If any one supposes that Religion and Reason are poles asunder, our author is here to disillusion him. He finds so much in common between them that it would be strange for him to find them to be antagonists. Enthusiastically does he point out that both of them seek for harmony and unity and refuse to take a departmental view of life. It is small wonder therefore, if, in spite of the difficulties of the problems involved in the issues of authority and tradition versus personal search and conviction, of felt experience versus intelligent interpretation, Mr. Pollard chooses to err, if he errs at all, on the side of human intellect, and of defending its ways and aspirations, rather than on the side of the arbitrary and the irrational. In fighting thus the cause of Reason in Religion and Morals, our author has given us a thoughtful, lucid and stimulating book.

JAGADISAN M. KUMARAPPA

Twentieth-Century Addresses. By PROF. E. C. DICKINSON and PROF. DIWAN CHAND SHARMA. (Macmillan & Co. London. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

If Indian students are impatient of authority, it is perhaps because they are invited to improve their minds by such anthologies as this. The idea of serving up to young men in the new Indian universities a collection of recent addresses by famous men is no doubt an excellent way of acquainting them with passably good English "as she is spoke". But when these addresses are carefully chosen for moral edification, for inspiring hero-worship, "as an antidote to aggressive patriotism" (as the preface tells us), or in short, for any reason but their own sake, they take on an air of propaganda. At worst they lapse into academic prosing, as does the address of Mr. Asquith on "Criticism".

The truth is that a great address usually depends on a great occasion. The late M. Briand made such an address when he welcomed Germany for the first time into membership of the League of Nations. An address of this kind, great in itself, is more truly enlarging to the mind than one delivered in academic robes before a lethargic Senate house. But even the academic addresses are ill-chosen. Surely Sir J. M. Barrie on "Courage" would have been better than Mr. Baldwin on "Truth and Politics".

There are perhaps two addresses only which justify their choice for this anthology—Sir Rabindranath Tagore on "My School," and Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch on "Jargon". Would that all schools could, like Tagore's, be founded on the traditions of the forest colonies of Indian teachers. Would that all writers of English could take to heart Q's brilliant and amusing dissection of the lazy, fogging, shuffling habit of jargon. There is little permanent worth in the address of Lord Rosebery, given in 1913, on "The Power and Responsibility of the Press". It dates already. The addresses of the scholarly politicians, Lord Balfour, Lord Haldane, Mr. Baldwin, Lord Morley, and Mr. Sastri, are singularly dull, despite their polished phrasing and learned quotations. That of Mr. Galsworthy is, of course, vital and sincere, but sadly disjointed.

If there is a moral in this book it is that an anthology should not try to point morals, even with the aid of the biggest names in politics.

G. W. WHITEMAN

CORRESPONDENCE

SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY

In *Nature*, March 7, 1931, p. 340, I pointed out that the modern etymology of the word "philosophy" has not been accepted by all scholars. Professor Wadia, (THE ARYAN PATH, January 1932, p. 10), assumes that it means "love of truth," and others describe a philosopher as a "lover of wisdom". M. Ragon, the French authority of the last century on the Egyptian Mysteries, identified *Philo* with *Pothos* (from which *Eros* is derived) the universal, creative energy of Nature. Hence *Philosophia* originally signified knowledge of the creating energies within objective phenomena; and a *philosopher* one who had assimilated in himself, or personified, as it were, creative knowledge and could experimentally demonstrate it. If the tradition be true that Pythagoras refused to allow himself to be called a philosopher he must have known *scientific* philosophers of greater knowledge than himself.

*Reasoning,** in the modern philosophical meaning, that is *speculative thinking*, has not as such contributed to the advancement of knowledge, either in the East or the West. The activity in the search for the knowledge that has been noticeable in the West since the "Revival of Learning" has been due to experimental research. Francis Bacon, the supposed founder of experimental science, warned experimentalists against the Idols of the Mind† formed by speculative thought; and he considered that the philosophical speculations of the schoolmen were a barrier to open-minded investigations of Nature and had added nothing to human knowledge.

It is difficult to see where there is any advance in modern "philosophical thought" *as apart from scientific knowledge*, over the abortive postulates of the Mediæval "philosophers" of Europe. After the Renaissance European thinkers had the ancient literature of Greece (originally influenced by Egypt and India) to stimulate their ideas. Descartes, Leibnitz and Spinoza were *intuitive* thinkers and may have inspired experimental researches indirectly, especially Descartes; but modern *knowledge* of the principles operating in Nature is due to pioneer *workers*, such as Paracelsus and Roger Bacon, both acknowledged now by official science.

Western scholars have proved conclusively that modern science owes its inception to students of ancient literatures and exponents of the traditional knowledge of Eastern peoples. It did not rise *de novo* in Europe. And it seems certain that the distinction obtaining to-day between "science" and "philosophy" originated in the West. This distinction is artificial and may, in the end, be fatal to the advancement of knowledge, scientific workers succumb to the lure of speculative thinking and Idealism, as seems now to be the tendency.

The antithesis of "philosophy" *and* "religion," or of "science" *and* "religion," is also superficial. As "philosophers" originally obtained the data on which to speculate from scientific knowledge, so the doctrines of the various religions were derived from the experiences of scientific philosophers, in M. Ragon's sense. This knowledge was diluted and perverted to suit the desires and mentality of the populace.‡ Prof. Wadia shows how philosophy degenerated into theology in India and has been used to keep the masses of the people in thrall to superstition and false gods. But would it have been so mis-

* Originally, to reason meant to deal with ratios, just as *Mathesis* meant *proportion*; but both reasoning and mathematics have long since become speculative. Their symbols may denote merely arbitrary values, and the premises of a theory or argument be hypothetical and not in accordance with the actual nature of things. Thus many contradictory theories are evolved by speculation.

† See Section II, *Novum Organum*, also *Preliminarics* of *De Augmentis Scientiarum*.

‡ See, *The Asiatic Review*, October 1931, p. 764.

used if it had not repudiated or misinterpreted the science which gave it birth? The same thing happened in Europe, and the organized religion of the West has not been more "exalted" than that of India. The only difference to-day is that it has lost its hold on the masses in Europe but still has a subtle hold on the mentality of some of the intellectual classes by means of (1) the hereditary notion of an extracosmic god, and (2) a "mystical philosophy" peculiarly characteristic of the West.

Priest-craft is a fine art. It adapts its "philosophy" to the times. It is now taking advantage of the reaction from the exclusively physical interpretations of the universe and the premature nihilistic conclusions of modern science. It is encouraging speculative thinking for very good reasons, namely: that "systems of thought" are always coloured by the peculiar temperament of the thinker, and this human idiosyncrasy is known to be more often emotional than rational. Man is never satisfied for long by an explanation of the world that is obvious to the superficial senses. He craves some emotional, if not miraculous, ingredient. These desires of the populace are satisfied by the sensational effects of rituals; those of certain intellectual classes by the emotional effects of "mystical" ideas, so-called "spiritual truths".

As the West has only one word, "spirit," which denotes not only its anthropomorphic god, but also *alcohol, spirited* animals, "manifestations of *spirits*" at séances, and *spiritual* visions of neurotic mystics, Indian metaphysicians might be justified in doubting the *Atmic* quality of the "spiritual peaks" of Western philosophy.

Whether in the East or the West a scientific philosopher could only refer to "spirit" as energy, the opposite polarity of the energy known to man as "matter". The state or "frequency-level" of spirit must be beyond man's physico-mental perceptions. If it be possible to know those ultra-physical states they could not be described in terms of men's present knowledge; and it is presumptuous and unscientific to attempt to discuss the Absolute—perpetual, ceaseless Motion, with the finite, concrete mind.

Just as states of atomic physics cannot be interpreted in terms of molar physics nor explained to a mere mechanical engineer, so one would logically conclude that states of ultra-physical (or spiritual) atomic reactions could not be discussed in terms of the "energy supplied by the West," or, indeed, of the energy emanating from any part of the known world to-day.

London W. W. L.

IN VINDICATION OF VEGETARIANISM

The vegetarian holds that the eating of animal corpses, though it may befit animal scavengers, is not consistent with the evolutionary status of man.

Man's chief patrimony was evolved during a period of protracted arboreal existence, when he was largely a vegetarian. In Java, for instance, aboriginal forest dwellers have been observed to wander about, changing their abode according to the fruits in season in the various localities. Such and similar observations confirm the view that primitive man was not as a rule a habitual slaughterer or devourer of other animals.

In their work on *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, Dr. Hose and Dr. McDougal point out that the Punans are the finest of the people of Borneo. They are so primitive, so uncivilised, that they cultivate no crops and have no domesticated animals. They live entirely upon the wild produce of the jungle. Comparison with the natural history of social animals allows the inference that the Punans are mainly vegetarian, a conclusion that seems further corroborated by the data supplied by the afore-mentioned observers. For they tell us that the sole handicrafts of these primitive people are the making of baskets, mats, blow-pipes, and the implements used for working the wild sago. All other manufactured articles used by them, including swords and spears, they obtain

by barter from other peoples. Like many vegetarian social animals, they are strictly monogamous and reliable in character, helping, instead of eating one another in danger and in decrepitude.

There is evidence to show that lapse into scavengerdom was the chief cause of the decline and extinction of many human species in the past. According to the laws of organic interdependence, to abuse animals to the extent of killing them for the sake of their flesh constitutes an excess of exploitation and in fact a form of parasitism. The best and most ideal biological relation is, on the contrary, one in which the exchange of services between species and species is not carried to the point of parasitic murder. It should be remembered in this connection that in Nature the sequel to parasitism is everywhere this calamitous degeneracy. Truly was it said by Emerson that "to receive services and render none in return is the one base thing in the universe".

In the old days, the advocacy of slavery was carried on in much the same hypocritical way as is to-day the defence of meat-eating. Slavery, the casuists said, may be "against the law of Nature"; but it was "according to the law of nations". To such pleaders amenity is the sole appeal, both in physiological and in ethical relations—a dangerous position from more than one point of view. The vegetarian appeal, *per contra*, is to eternal justice, regarding which Edmund Burke wrote that it is the one thing, the only one thing which defies all mutation; that it existed before the world, and will survive the fabric of the world itself. It is debasing also, to depute to others the brutalising work of slaughtering. Again, such practices cannot but react unfavourably upon the morale of the community. We speak of "butcherliness," to denote brutal, cruel, and savage manners.

The mammalia, in particular, which we slaughter for culinary purposes, are our close kin in the evolutionary scale. It is one of the marks of the true parasite that it feeds upon substance, which have already been built up and organised into a close similarity with its own bodily fabric. Perpetual "in-feeding" of this sort is evil and "abhorred by Nature," since it abuses a biologically essential chain of processes by which we turn vegetable substances into flesh, just as plants build up their organic matter from mineral. Involved is here "Evolution by Co-operation".

Think ye that the mighty result of evolution is so easily obtained that it should not matter what one eats and what one does? Believe ye that nothing but amenity and expediency count, that species have but to eat one another for progressive syntheses to result? Alas, the world is governed with very little wisdom! Alas too, "there is no health in us!" When our monetary currency goes wrong, we usually know what is the cause of it. Well known for instance, is the debasing effect of bad coins. The rule is that bad currency drives out good. A good currency, moreover, has a legitimate basis in service and in work. It is not obtained for nothing, not by the mere printing of notes for instance, *i. e.* by neglecting the matter of redemption—the *quid pro quo*. Benefit is the end of Nature, but for every benefit obtained a toll is levied. Our physiological currency also needs a legitimate basis in service, failing which it becomes debased, thus landing us in disease and in degeneration, of which, alas, we can boast a rich measure. The more a man becomes a beef-eater, the less will the care for instance for fruits—bad coinage driving out good. Such an one, moreover, becomes the possessor of all manner of noxious micro-organisms, the need of placation of which takes him still further away from the pathway of legitimacy. His adaptation is along the path of the wolf, the hyena, the lion and the tiger—outlaws, which the evolutionary process is about to throw on the rubbish heap. "The faults of this western world are hideous," says Prof. Gilbert Murray, "the taint runs through it of blood and of alcohol. It is stamped by the institution of war, by the degradation of the poor, by drink, gambling, vice." Those pimply, ponder-

ous, encumbered people whom one still meets abundantly, they are diseased and the victims of meat-eating habits past and present. Their appearance is enough to make one apply to modern England what Bebel, the Socialist, said of pre-war Germany: "only a great misfortune can save us". Had not the war, with its sufferings, acted as an eye-opener, we should still probably be little sensitive on the subject of food.

I am satisfied, on empirical grounds alone that most of our diseases are due to our wrong feeding habits. There is, moreover, plentiful experimental evidence to show that habitual in-feeding actually does act injuriously and debasingly. The experiments of Richet's school, in particular, have shown that the (protein) of one animal, applied to that of another, acts deleteriously and that the system in order to defend its individuality has to defend itself against such intrusions, it being thus confirmed that there is a natural and universal revulsion to predatory methods of life. All of which shows that our salvation lies in the avoidance of short-cuts for that is what carnivorism, in common parlance, amounts to. It is with health and evolution precisely as it is with character. They cannot be won by short-cuts, but must be created by genuine *i. e.*, legitimate, activity. Just as character is the abiding product of an innumerable series of thoughts and deeds appearing singly of little consequence, but growing through the slow accretions of habit to its ultimate stature, so our physiological or "humoral" personality (determined by "humours") is the product of countless ingestions and (protein) intoxications, which by their cumulative effects, have altered each of us, leaving indelible effects. The self-indulgent man, fond of taking the short cut, is quite blind to the truth that health and evolution walk on the road of biological "righteousness," *i. e.*, legitimacy. To forsake the true road of life—the road of "cross-feeding," consistent with the established order of Nature, —is to foreswear the great goal of life. It may here be recalled that Darwin spoke of "felony" in the case of bees obtaining supplies of nectar by short cuts, instead of getting them "legitimately" *i. e.*, non-parasitically. If we dodge our normal biological tasks, we shall find that in the end obstacles bulk the more formidably. Modern civilisation will have to decide, sooner or later, whether it will abandon the path of scavengerdom, or take the alternative course of developing into a race of hopeless valetudinarians, obliged to augment their already swollen army of doctors and nurses, until all citizens,—subject, by their feeding habits, to cancer, pneumonia, rheumatism, influenza, and a host of other "mysterious" diseases,—will be able periodically to command a supply of, say, ten specialists and six nurses to patch them up or even to shepherd them from the cradle to the early grave. "Our reliance upon the physician," said Emerson, "is a despair of ourselves".

The common illusion nowadays is that fleshmeat is a necessity of life, and this it is which blinds many to the advantages of a non-flesh diet. Yet the prescribed diet for the athlete nowadays is a non-flesh one. In medical circle it is now fairly widely recognised that a vegetarian diet provides pure blood, which combats disease and aids recovery from injuries, whilst it has often been shown that meat-eating does the reverse and tends to create a desire for drinks and also to stimulate the lower passions.

People should remember that one is easily the dupe of what one loves, and that the love of roast-beef is such that it is only too likely to pervert human mentality.

If, for a court of appeal one turns to Nature, one finds that everywhere the social and state-forming (vegetarian) animals rank higher, and are more successful, than the solitary (flesh-eating), and that everywhere carnivorism condemns the species to backwardness and inferiority. Could anything be more convincing?

London H. REINHEIMER

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"_____ *ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."

HUDIBRAS.

Month by month this journal has tried to gather together differing views on many different subjects held by men belonging to various schools of thought. It has also tried to present the Theosophical views of H. P. Blavatsky on these very topics. More than one esteemed correspondent, among our contributors and readers, has remarked upon our attitude and our work; one of them writing about our programme and policy referred in passing to "a certainly amazing phenomenon that Madame Blavatsky has something to say on so many branches of not only mystical but also of mundane knowledge". We have desired this recognition of her vast and variegated store-house of instruction, especially from those who are moulders of public opinion, for, such recognition will pave the way for an acceptance of her ideas at least as theories.

Our world is in sore need of an ethical philosophy—that is acknowledged by all; we are convinced that Theosophy is such a philosophy; we are convinced that it is capable of transforming the attitude of the individual, and of changing the mind of the race. Though immemorial and ancient "in the course of time the mighty art was lost"—that art of living founded on the synthesis of science, religion, and philosophy; and it was H. P. Blavatsky who restored it in the modern world. "It is even the same exhaustless, secret, eternal doctrine" of the *Bhagavad-Gita* (IV.2-3) about which she said (*Secret Doctrine*, I. xlvi):

> To the public in general and the readers of the "Secret Doctrine" I may repeat what I have stated all along, and which I now clothe in the words of Montaigne: Gentlemen, "I HAVE HERE MADE ONLY A NOSEGAY OF CULLED FLOWERS, AND HAVE BROUGHT NOTHING OF MY OWN BUT THE STRING THAT TIES THEM." Pull the "string" to pieces and cut it up in shreds, if you will. As for the nosegay of FACTS—you will never be able to make away with these. You can only ignore them, and no more.

During this month of May—on the eighth—students of Theosophy belonging to various Theosophical organizations will celebrate the anniversary of Madame Blavatsky's death; and at their gatherings, as desired by her, in her last Will, extracts will be read from *The Bhagavad-Gita* and *The Light of Asia*—two of her favourite books, which embody the same grand and beautiful

Truths she herself laboured hard to propagate. Therefore, it is an opportunity and we will use it to put before our readers the Theosophical position about the one subject which is agitating all people—*viz.*, the betterment of the race. We say—Theosophical position; and it is necessary to add that we refer to the profound philosophy which Madame Blavatsky taught and not to the bizarre dogmas with which the world has been inundated under the name of Theosophy ever since her death. One of the duties of THE ARYAN PATH is to enable the world to distinguish between the pure Theosophy of H.P. Blavatsky and that pseudo-theosophy which is rooted in absurd claims of deluded claimants.

The Ethics of Theosophy are its most vital aspect, and they are shown to be rational and profound by the metaphysics of Theosophy. Theosophy, wrote Madame Blavatsky,

> was intended to stem the current of materialism, and also that of spiritualistic phenomenalism and the worship of the Dead. It had to guide the spiritual awakening that has now begun, and not to pander to psychic cravings which are but another form of materialism. For by "materialism" is meant not only an anti-philosophical negation of pure spirit, and, even more, materialism in conduct and action—brutality, hypocrisy, and, above all, selfishness,—but also the fruits of a disbelief in all but material things, a disbelief which has increased enormously during the last century, and which has led many, after a denial of all existence other than that in matter, into a blind belief in the *materialization of Spirit*. The tendency of modern civilization is a reaction towards animalism, towards a development of those qualities which conduce to the success in life of man as an animal in the struggle for animal existence. Theosophy seeks to develop the human nature in man in addition to the animal, and at the sacrifice of the superfluous animality which modern life and materialistic teachings have developed to a degree which is abnormal for the human being at this stage of his progress. (*Five Messages*, p. 6)

To combat this materialism in conduct and action, which still flourishes, Theosophy offers principles and rules of ethics not for mere belief but for actual practice, and thus teaches the animal-man to be a human-man. Theosophy insists that man shall understand why he should do good and how and thus advocates the double activity of learning and doing. To do good seems an easy task, but to do it rightly—! The knowledge of what is good to do is not easily acquired. Who is ignorant of the elements of good life and good labour? None; and yet when called upon to define what self-sacrifice is, or whence selfishness, or why one should be sober, or how to mortify the personal self—there are not only differences of opinion but a grand confusion. Theosophy helps its students to give definite values and names to definite principles and things; thus its abstract philosophy produces a very concrete system of ethics.

Between philosophy and ethics there is a divorce; Theosophy regards them as two sides of a shield and offers an ethical philosophy by which life is to be lived day by day. Theosophy has joined together what theology of every organized religion succeeded in pulling asunder. Theosophy has garbed in reasoned explanation the ethics of the old world—of the Sermon on the Mount, the Tao-teh-King, the Dhammapada, the Bhagavad-Gita, and has made its rules and injunctions useful for personal application.

"*Teach to eschew all causes; the ripple of effects, as the great tidal wave, thou shalt let run its course.*"

This ancient aphorism is once again taught in Theosophy.

Work with causes; leave effects to work themselves out; "the suppression of one single bad *cause* will suppress not one, but a variety of bad effects". If we enquire—wherein lies the *cause* of human misery? we learn that—"Verily there is not an accident in our lives, not a misshapen day, or a misfortune, that could not be traced back to our own doings in this or in another life. If one breaks the laws of Harmony .... one must be prepared to fall into the chaos one has oneself produced." And what is true of the individual is equally true of any assemblage of individuals—a nation, a race, etc. Laws of Harmony are named laws of Life and collectively the Law of Ethical Causation. That Law "predestines nothing and no one .... creates nothing, nor does it design. It is man who plans and creates causes, and the law adjusts the effects; which adjustment is not an act, but universal harmony, tending ever to resume its original position, like a bough, which, bent down too forcibly, rebounds with corresponding vigour. If it happen to dislocate the arm that tried to bend it out of its natural position, shall we say that it is the bough which broke our arm, or that our own folly has brought us to grief?" (*Secret Doctrine*, II, 305)

Two difficulties arise: first, people find it very difficult to live by the discipline which alone uncovers the causes of events to their gaze; secondly, the zest, the enjoyment, the feeling of emotional more-ness are so bound up with effects, that most people do not like to leave them alone—till suffering compels them. People eat the fruit of Karma, and even when their attention is drawn to the fact that it is poison-fruit, they say—"may be so, but it tastes good"; once again, it is abject suffering which dissuades them from pursuing the old course. Among these defaulters are many Theosophical students themselves—for they too are mortals on whom the yoke of sense presses heavily.

However, from this central truth of Theosophical ethics an entirely new attitude to life, work and people arises. Altruism and disinterestedness assume new meanings; luxuries and necessities take new values; and altogether new standards of life reveal themselves. Not only is all this true in the world of objects; the affections and attachments

undergo a transformation—blood-ties, religious bonds, patriotism, are assigned different prices. Further still, progress and civilization, knowledge and inventions of Science don quite new garbs. The past and the future lose their vagueness; they begin to live in new forms. Just as for the astronomer and the mathematician the firmament speaks a language other than that for the men of city-streets, so also space and time and all objects therein tell a tale of themselves to the Theosophist, different from what falls on the ears of flesh. Aspirants and students of Theosophy try to gain and retain this new attitude, and among them are those who belong to no Theosophical organisation.

But is not this task a special one, which the large masses of people cannot undertake?—we will be asked. Theosophy answers—that is not wholly true. For, there are four links of the golden chain which should bind the masses and the classes in every land, as well as nations and races, into one family, one Universal Brotherhood. They are (1) Universal Unity and Causation; (2) Human Solidarity; (3) the Law of Karma; (4) Reincarnation. These lead to a full recognition of equal rights and privileges for all, and without distinction of race, colour, social position, or birth. Let the natural leaders of the masses, those whose modes of thought and action will sooner or later be adopted by those masses, begin to learn and live by the ethics of Theosophy, and they will be able to teach these facts, suited to the mass *mind*, and elevate it. For every class as for every temperament Theosophy has instruction and guidance.

Lest all this may sound arrogant, or like making special claims on behalf of Theosophy, we will quote these words of H. P. Blavatsky:—

> Theosophists are of necessity the friends of all movements in the world, whether intellectual or simply practical, for the amelioration of the condition of mankind. We are the friends of all those who fight against drunkenness, against cruelty to animals, against injustice to women, against corruption in society or in government, although we do not meddle in politics. We are the friends of those who exercise practical charity, who seek to lift a little of the tremendous weight of misery that is crushing down the poor. (*Five Messages*, p. 8)

We will close with a description of the practical working of the doctrine of *Universal* Brotherhood which the Masters of H. P. Blavatsky gave:—

> *He who does not practise altruism; he who is not prepared to share his last morsel with a weaker or poorer than himself; he who neglects to help his brother man, of whatever race, nation, or creed, whenever and wherever he meets suffering, and who turns a deaf ear to the cry of human misery; he who hears an innocent person slandered, whether a brother theosophist or not, and does not undertake his defence as he would undertake his own—is no theosophist.*

ॐ

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light ! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. III JUNE 1932 No. 6

SUGGESTION

Here is a lucid explanation given by the late Mr. Robert Crosbie, which will serve as an answer to enquiries received by us on the subject of the influence and power of suggestion:—

The power of suggestion means many different things to many minds. It is coupled with the idea of hypnosis, where the operator is able to make the subject think, say, do, or imagine anything he chooses. That is possible through the abnormal condition of the subject. The means and methods of inducing this abnormal condition are not generally known, although some practitioners have hit upon various ways of bringing on hypnosis in some subjects.

But what is to be considered is the fact of suggestion itself, generally considered, and as it affects all men. People are not aware that they act almost entirely under suggestion. From our birth we are surrounded by those who suggest certain ideas to us as being true, and we follow those suggested ideas.

There is very, very little *original* thought anywhere and particularly is this true in those lines to which the public pays the most attention, that is, politics, religion, science. Whatever system of thought is presented to us, that we adopt. We follow the suggestion given with no attempt to reach to the basis of that which is suggested. The foundation upon which the suggestion rests is taken for granted, even in the most important things in life.

Our religion, for example, is stated to us to be a "revelation". We accepted it in childhood, accepted it as a fact, without looking into it to see what it

is and on what it is based. Our powers of thought and action being based upon a false suggestion does not inhibit their exercise, but it means that all our possibilities of thought and action, all our mental creations, the whole superstructure of our existence, will be false, because, thinking from false premises, our thinking will inevitably lead to false conclusions.

And this is just as truly the fact as in the case of the hypnotized subject. He is thrown into an abnormal condition; he has nothing before his mind; the operator presents a given idea and with it the suggestion of a certain mode of action. Immediately the subject adopts the suggestion, goes to work on it, and will continue working along the suggested line cumulatively until the suggestion is changed.

Those who are born into any particular sect ought to know this. With our first sense of understanding ideas are presented to us, instilled into our minds as absolute facts. We proceed from that basis, and however long it is followed, no true understanding or conclusion can be reached. What do we know of the truth or falsity of these ideas when presented to us in childhood? Nothing whatever. What do our parents and teachers know of them? They have merely passed on to us the suggestions which they received in childhood and which have operated in them cumulatively ever since.

We must learn not to accept statements, no matter by whom made, simply because they are made to us. We must get at the basis of whatever is presented to us, know what its principles are, whether those principles are *self-evident*. If they are not self-evident, how can they be *basic*?

The idea is common to everybody in the Western world that there is a Creator of this universe. What do we know about it? Does the acceptance of that idea give us any understanding? If it is true that a being created the universe and all the beings in it, then we are not responsible. In continuance of that idea other ideas follow it: the idea that man is here but once, that this is his only birth and that from here he knows not where he goes. We have followed the suggestion that man lives but one life, that he is fundamentally irresponsible for his being here, and we have built up our thoughts and actions on that basis. Does it make us wiser, happier, while we live? Does it produce peace and happiness for others? Does it bring us to the end of life, any wiser, any better off? For we know that when we come to the end of life we live every earthly thing we have gained while here.

But this earth is only one of many earths. What of the other planets, the other solar systems with which space is filled? Have we any vital knowledge in regard to them or the reason for their existence under the suggestions that have been handed to us?

And when our religious impressions are changed, when other suggestions are given us, are they not handed to us in the same way? Whatever they are—"Mental Science," "New Thought," "Christian Science," and so on—we adopt them, move along the lines suggested by those who give them to us, and what do we really learn? Nothing. We come to the end of life just as encased in ignorance for all the "revelations" ever given us. What do we know of their bases? Are they true or only partially so? We are never asked to look into their fundamentals to see for ourselves if they are true, self-evident. No; we are asked to accept what is given us and go to work on that. That is suggestion.

Our municipal life, our national life, our political life, are all under suggestion, and they are but few who try to go to the root of things and understand what the nature of being is, so that they can know for themselves and thus act with power and knowledge. As we look the field over we will find that we are all prey to the power of suggestion in every direction.

What is the criterion which we should apply to every suggestion presented to us? Just this: If we have the truth it will explain what was before a mystery. And as we are surrounded by mysteries, the Truth must explain them all.

This power of suggestion must still be used, whatever line may be pointed out to us. If Truth exists and is possible to us—the Truth in religion, science and philosophy—it must first come to us by suggestion from those who know. If it were not possible for this to be done, were not possible for us to avail ourselves of it, then there would be no use in talking of these things. But when the true is suggested to us, there is always a means presented by which we may see and verify it. That means is not in any one's authority or endorsement, but in the fact that we can perceive it and test it for ourselves. *The final authority is the man himself.*

Having become indifferent to objects of perception, the pupil must seek out the Raja of the senses, the Thought-Producer, he who awakes illusion. The Mind is the great Slayer of the Real. Let the Disciple slay the Slayer. Mind is like a mirror; it gathers dust while it reflects. It needs the gentle breezes of Soul-Wisdom to brush away the dust of our illusions. Seek O Beginner, to blend thy Mind and Soul. Have mastery o'er thy Soul, O seeker after truths undying, if thou would'st reach the goal.

—THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE

THE PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF WORLD UNDERSTANDING

[**F. S. C. Northrop** is now the Advocate Professor of Philosophy at Yale University, and Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

In this article he views the march of scientific materialism, on a new route, which starts in Greece; he traces the fundamental difference between Europe and America and then offers some interesting reflections about the basic distinction between the West and the East. The West is struggling to perceive the reality of matter and form, the East to uncover their maya.—EDS.]

It should be a commonplace of all conduct that man can only do what his mind sets before him as a possibility. Hence all of man's creations, including even his culture, are a function of his imagination. Or stated negatively, man cannot initiate a definite line of conduct if that particular type of behaviour has never occurred to him as a possibility.

It is important to keep this in mind in considering the difficult problem of world understanding. This becomes evident when it is noted that in asking one people to understand another, particularly if the one is of the East and the other of the West, we are often asking them to appreciate as of vital importance attitudes toward life and experience which have never occurred to them even in imagination as possibilities. The point is that every division of humanity, as its civilization and culture come to fruition, unconsciously is guided to certain phases of experience in terms of which it conceives of life and reality, and shapes its own destiny. Moreover these categories differ from people to people, and within a given culture from time to time. The tendency is also for each people and period to conceive of its categories as all-sufficient.

The briefest consideration of the development of Western history will make this clear. The matter can be best approached by directing attention upon a certain point. Consider the entirely different interests of men in Western Europe in the Middle Ages and in the Modern World. Then if one were to think of an outstanding person, a Churchman would come to mind, now an industrialist holds the same position; then man's interest was more in some other world, now it is concentrated in feverish activity upon this one. Why the difference? Certainly the universe of experience from which all knowledge and thought is drawn does not change, nor has man himself in his physiological organization been altered. Even the most ardent temporalist, the most excited student of biological and human evolution must admit that such changes call for hundreds of thousands of years and not a few odd centuries for their consummation. Clearly it is man's

thought concerning what is important in life which has changed. In short, it is his philosophy that has altered.

Once this is recognised we find ourselves with a certain philosophy of history. It may be stated as follows: *Each age or culture is the fruition in practice of a certain philosophy in thought. When the philosophy changes civilization is altered.*

Let us note precisely how this has worked itself out in the last twenty-odd centuries of history. Again, because of my own familiarity with this subject, I choose the Western World, meaning by that, more particularly, the civilization of Western Europe and America.

This story is for the most part an account of the scientific attitude of mind, although if so regarded, it must be recognized that science takes on different meanings and emphases at different stages of its history. Elsewhere* I have given a rough account of this development. Only a few major points need be noted here.

This new era in Western culture opened when the Greeks became logical about the observed factors of their experience. Before them there had been science of the empirical type. But for the most part, it was with the Greeks that facts were brought under general principles and required to fit into and be illuminated by theoretical ideas that meet the test of consistency.

By thus combining an increasing number of observations of nature with disciplined formal thinking concerning these empirical materials the Greeks gradually came through science to three rival philosophical conceptions of the nature of things. I have called them the physical, mathematical and functional theories of nature. They are to be associated roughly with Leucippus, Plato, and Aristotle respectively.

The outlines of these theories are well known. The physical theory of nature, better known as the kinetic atomic theory, conceives of reality as an infinite number of very small invisible particles of matter in motion in a vast infinitely extended container called absolute space. The mathematical theory entails the conception of nature as a system of pure ideas or forms, which may be grasped only with the intellect and which are in themselves purely formal. The functional theory regards nature as a process of becoming, a teleological activity in which matter and form interact to constitute the experienced universe.

It is to be noted that these three theories turn around one fundamental issue: the question of the relation between matter and form. Thus the physical theory holds that all form except spatial relatedness reduces to matter and motion, the mathematical theory holds that all matter is a mere appearance which is conditioned completely by form, whereas the functional theory takes the other

* *Science and First Principles.* (Macmillan, New York, 1931)

position that both matter and form are causes.

This issue between matter and form is very important for an understanding of Western civilization. It is the constant factor throughout Western thought. *Only if one recognizes that the West is concentrating on the question as to whether matter or form is primary can its history be understood or its difference from the culture of the East be appreciated.* To the latter point we shall return later.

Let us consider first how the three theories formulated by the Greeks worked themselves out in history. Since they constitute the only possible answers to the problem of the relation between matter and form, it follows, unless Western thought shifts its attention to an entirely different issue, that the history of the Western world can be nothing more or less than the story of the fate of these three theories before historical circumstance and new empirical evidence. As I have indicated elsewhere this happens to be the case.

Following the Greek period the mathematical theory in the form of a degenerate Platonism overlaid with mysticism from the East, came into the ascendancy. From this ascendancy the Middle or Dark Ages follows quite naturally. Attention upon the epistemological consequences of a mathematical philosophy will make this clear. We have noted that this theory regards the universe as a system of eternal changeless forms which can only be grasped by the intellect. Obviously such a thesis goes counter to what nature exhibits itself as being. Certainly nature is observed to be physical and to be changing. To this a defender of the mathematical theory can make but one reply: reality is quite different from what nature appears to be. Thus there arises the Platonic epistemological principle to the effect, that the real is suggested by but not contained in sensation.

Stated more bluntly, this means that one cannot make the mathematical theory reasonable without deprecating nature in itself in the interest of some other ideal world known only by reason. Thus the Middle Ages with its neglect of science and its otherworldly interest arises. In short, once man gets the idea that the real things in life are outside the world of sensation, loss of interest in this world follows naturally. In this manner philosophy determines the character of the civilization of an Age.

Space does not permit a detailed completion of the story. The interested reader will find it in the book to which I have previously referred. Suffice it to say that with Thomas Aquinas the foundations of Western culture were hifted from the philosophy of Plato to that of Aristotle, which teaches that the real is given in the world of sensation, thus bringing back an interest in nature for its own sake, from which humanism and science naturally follow, and that in the seventeenth century with Galilei and Newton the physical theory of nature became the dominant intellectual chart for Western conduct.

EUROPE *vs.* AMERICA

This last point is very important. It must be fully grasped if modern Western Europe and particularly the United States are to be understood. *The physics of Galilei and Newton is the key to the modern Western World.* This elemental fact is usually overlooked, even by the philosophers of Europe and America. *The fact is that Western modern professional philosophy is not the philosophy of the modern Western World.* Spinoza, Kant, Hegel and Bradley are reactions from the real philosophy of Western thought, rather than expressions of it. To be sure, they are reactions which can be easily understood and to some extent justified, since they but correct in the field of the theory of knowledge the obvious inadequacies of the physical theory of nature which Galilei and Newton introduced. But modern civilization itself has had its attention on the verified truth of Galilei's and Newton's physics, and not on its short-comings as a complete philosophy. This truth as traditionally conceived is that nature is a system of masses operated on forces which move them in space and time. In short, the modern world is the fruit of the action of men who have been led ***not by an error of the moral judgment*** but by carefully controlled observation and experiment concerning nature to the conclusion that reality is a physical system of masses in motion under the action of forces.

Once this conception of that inexperience which is primary takes hold of the mind of men, is the Industrial Revolution any wonder? And do not the Carnegies and the Fords and Lindberghs become intelligible? If matter and motion are the alpha and omega of existence, then is not he the greatest who achieves the most spectacular triumphs in moving matter about over road or air or ocean?

It was said that the philosophy of Galilei and Newton must be sensed to appreciate America. The point here is that America is the only purely modern culture. Go to Western Europe and you see the modern world thrust within a Medieval background, proceed southward to Italy and one finds it crowded within the Medieval scene which in turn is wedged within an ancient setting. Only in America does the Modern world rest immediately against nature herself. Before anyone begins to criticize let him remember that the modern world rests on verified knowledge, not on an error of the moral judgment, and that it was discovered not by Americans but by an Italian and an Englishman.

One other characteristic of America remains to be noted, namely, its idealism. The hurried traveller who writes most of the books entirely misses this trait. Certain of those foreigners with

deeper insight who stay longer, regard it as one of the countries with most distinguishing characteristics. It is a unique idealism, best to be appreciated by contrasting it with the fatalism that hangs over Europe exactly as her past clings to her. This optimism, this faith that the ideal can be realized, that that which now is does not need to remain; this also, curiously enough, has its root in the physics of Galilei and Newton, notwithstanding the mechanical and deterministic character of that physics.

The key to this paradox centres in the fact that Galilei and Newton gave the world the first philosophy which was stated in terms of the near-at-hand. By doing this they removed man from the position of spectator to the rôle of actor on the great stage of life. The universe was brought down from the heavens where it existed with Plato and to much the same extent with Aristotle, and placed in the hands of man. Man was taught how by putting his hands on masses and forces and by following certain rules, he can change that in his immediate environment which he does not like. Thus optimism and the idea of progress took hold of the mind of man. In no place, because of its more purely modern character, do these concepts rule and flourish as in America. Again if one would understand the differences between a St. Augustine and a Lindbergh one must look to the underlying scientific philosophy of the ages in which they lived.

EAST RAISES A NEW-OLD ISSUE

The same is true of the relation between the East and the West. But here we pass to a very much deeper philosophical and metaphysical issue. It has been noted how the three major periods of Western history are functions of the periods of dominance of the three different possible theories of the relation between the material and formal factors in experience. Thus the differences between the Ages of Western Culture all fall within the issue concerning the relative primacy of matter and form. The difference between the East and the West, on the other hand, falls outside this issue. For the question which the East raises and answers, if I understand its major outlines correctly, in the negative, is whether either material or formal categories are primary at all. If this be true, it is utterly futile to talk about bringing the East and West together in understanding, without first creating a philosophy which provides meaning and vitality for the phases of experience which each treasures as real and all-important. Without this each is talking a philosophical language which the other does not understand, and neither can conceive even in the realm of imagination, of the possibility which the other has actualized in the very foundations of its thought and social institutions. Any attempt, no matter how crude and even erroneous, which throws light on this topic is therefore of extreme importance, now that international impacts are daily becoming more and more inevitable.

Consider for a moment two characteristics of the East which set it in contrast to the West. The one is its non-temporal character, the other, will be designated more explicitly later, but may be illustrated by the notion of Nirvana.

We have noted how the very essence of the West consists in revolutions in which passage occurs from a civilization with one character to another with a quite different character. Thus modern industrial America is as different from the Middle Ages as the East is from the West. The East, however, as Sarton has pointed out, has a more static character. Although all the types of Western Culture find echoes in varying schools of Eastern thought, the thing which most impresses a Westerner about the East is the extent to which its civilization today, apart from inroads from the West, is like its civilization twenty-five or fifty centuries ago. Whereas, the West seems to be grounded more on the concept of time, the East rests in contemplative repose in the very being of eternity.

The second characteristic of the East is harder to specify. Certainly it is that which the West finds most difficult to appreciate or understand. The average Westerner refers to it as the mysticism of the East. But even then he fails to understand it, for mysticism, unless I am greatly mistaken, is a far different thing to a Westerner from what it is to a sage of the Orient. For the mysticism of the West inevitably tends to make its experience a determinate experience of a determinate object. But the mysticism of the East, if genuine, is indeterminate and ineffable. And in the experience not merely does all determinateness disappear, but also any object and any subject or self. One is left with bare indeterminate experience itself. One has Nirvana in which all determinateness of experience is *thrown out* and only bare ineffable indeterminate experience remains. One has experience in its bare oneness with its full concreteness, richness and positiveness of actually experienced immediacy, without any of the differentiations and diversifications, and confusing and conflicting opposites and pluralisms which the fullness of naïve experience contains. In short, the East is concentrating its attention in experience on a factor quite different from the physical and formal aspects which have absorbed the thought and activity of the West. This is what was meant above when it was said that *the issue between the East and the West is not the issue between matter and form.* Stated more positively this means that the difference centres in the distinction between the material and formal attributes of reality and some third attribute.

THE PSYCHICAL CATEGORY

Now, curiously enough, an analysis of the factors in imme-

diate experience which the physical and formal categories of Western thought are insufficient to condition, has led the writer, by the method of residues, to the designation of a third phase of reality which it seems proper to term the psychical. Moreover, this psychical factor turns out to be precisely the bare indeterminate experienced quality which we have just designated above as the third phase of experience which the East regards as primary and upon which it concentrates the major emphasis of its attention.

Once these physical, formal and psychical attributes of metaphysical reality are compared with reference to their respective contributions to the full totality of experience, the distinctive features of Eastern and Western culture become somewhat more intelligible. For example, matter and form are many in character, *i.e.*, there are many particles of matter and many different forms. Hence to concentrate on physical and formal categories as the West has done is to be concerned with the differentiating characteristics of experience. Since these are continuously changing and are never exhausted, the West inevitably takes on a restless, unsettled and unsatisfied character. Moreover, since no present specific experience is ever perfect or free from the contradictions and unfulfilled desires which, as Schopenhauer saw, are the fruit of unhappiness and pessimism, this interest in the determinate character of experience results in the continuous attempt to improve the present state, and the endless chase of the ideal type of earthly order which is never realized. It is this interest in the determinate which causes the travelling American to feel ill at ease in a country which does not have the latest plumbing. The Easterner, on the other hand, is more concerned with bare experience itself. He knows to be sure that no naïve experience exists which is not determinate. Of course, an actual naïve experience must have some determinate character but because of his concentration on the psychical,—upon experience as experience and not as this particular experience, the particular determinateness which it has is more or less irrelevant. To the West, however, this concentration on indeterminate experience seems to be the concentration upon nothing. This follows because *the West in its absorption upon physical and formal categories has never grasped the true nature of the psychical.*

Always its handling of this category has been most crude. For it is ever identifying the psychical with a substance that is determinate since it is differentiated from material substance, or else it brings in such confused notions as vital energy or causal psychical factors. Because the material and formal aspects of experience introduce determinateness into experience, the West has fallen into the error of regarding the psychical as determinate also. Thus the concentration of the East upon bare indeterminate experience from

which, as the word Nirvana (to throw out) suggests, all specificity is eliminated, is not understood. But likewise the absorbed attention of the East upon the psychical leads it to deprecate the importance of the physical and formal.

It appears that *each civilization has its truth to deliver*, and that each has tended to exalt its partial conception into the totality of metaphysical reality itself. To-day as the instruments of the West's creation bring East and West into inevitable conjunction, it is the more imperative that each supplements its own attribute of the real with clear conceptions of the category or categories which its neighbour has mastered. Without this there can be no world understanding, no salvaging of the cultures which men have created. For what does not appear to the mind of man as a possibility can never take on actuality in his conduct. Clearly the shortened connections between the nations no longer permit the ideas of one people to remain in the chamber marked ignorance in the mind of the other, for the contact between the East and West is something actual. If the guiding light of that contact is not *mutual* understanding the result will be tragedy. It becomes evident therefore that the primary need of the world to-day is a philosophy which can provide meaning for a conception of experience which gives expression to the primary and true connections of the psychical, physical and formal attributes of reality. In short the task of world peace is a philosophical undertaking.

Let us not underestimate the magnitude of this task. There are many philosophers to-day who do justice to one or the other of these three primary attributes of reality which the separate civilizations of the earth have discovered. There is no traditional philosophy to my knowledge in either the East or the West which does justice to all three in one consistent system. In Western thought the philosophy of Aristotle came the nearest to this achievement, yet it failed to bring the psychical into an equal position of prominence and emphasis with the physical and the formal, and broke down utterly before the atomic and kinetic nature of matter which modern Western science has unequivocally revealed. Here is the real crux of the entire matter and the starting point from which all Western attacks on this problem must begin. Any philosophical theory which would attempt to bring the East and West together, or which would attempt even to reconcile the various truths of Western thought, without taking the kinetic atomic theory with metaphysical seriousness is simply attempting to destroy the modern world and to ignore the verified empirical evidence upon which it rests. It is from this physical kinetic theory and its consequence that the industrial character of Western civilization flows. To suppose that this phase of civilization can be destroyed is to suppose that reality is not what care-

ful study has revealed it to be. But to suppose likewise, as the Modern West has tended to do, that this is the end of matter is to show a shallowness of philosophical insight and an ignorance of the equally valid discoveries of other peoples and other periods which is equally fatuous. The path of wisdom, at least as approached from the West, obviously is to begin with the current world as it is and to correct its practices where the statements of its truth show those corrections to be necessary. This in the basic realm of theory means to begin with the kinetic atomic theory and to attempt upon such foundations to construct a philosophy which gives equal and proper primacy to monistic, formal and psychical principles.

It happens that the very science which produced this modern theory finds such changes to be necessary. The writer in the book previously indicated has made a preliminary attempt to indicate what the nature of these changes must be. The result seems to be a radically amended atomic theory which develops into a complete metaphysics in which physical, formal and psychical attributes turn out to be primary in precisely the manner this paper has suggested. Only time can tell whether this suggestion is a genuine solution of our problem. In any event, the fact remains that the task of world understanding entails nothing less than the construction of a new and more catholic metaphysic which will provide man with a theory that gives meaning to, and makes possible the appreciation of, the achievements of his earthly neighbours in time and space.

F. S. C. NORTHROP

A BLIND MAN BUT A KARMA-YOGI

(*An Interview*)

[**N. B. Parulekar,** Editor of *Sakal* interviewed Sadashiv Shastri Bhide, a lover of the *Gita* and a founder of the *Gita* Dharma Mandal.—EDS.]

"In the *Gita* you find the waters of philosophy poured into the moulds of practical life. It is an unique piece of literature—its language inimitable, its teaching uplifting and its presentation of the subject, both critical and methodical. This is the best book to give into the hands of those who may care to acquaint themselves with the Hindu view of life."

Such is the estimate of the *Gita* in the words of Sadashiv Shastri Bhide, a philosopher, a seeker, and a religious critic of Maharashtra. He is the founder of the Gita Dharma Mandal whose object is to propagate the teaching of the *Gita*. He is the author of many books and is known from Bombay to Benares as a religious thinker. My visit proved unusually enlightening.

"How did you happen to be attracted to the *Gita*? Was there any special occasion or experience in your life which compelled you to go to it?"

"As you see," replied Bhide Shastri, "for the last forty-six years I have been going without eyes. Smallpox snatched away the sight almost overnight. I was a boy of seven. It was a curious experience. It made me feel older, more mature. My childhood days suddenly disappeared. However the very pressure of the unhappy event opened out a possibility. People in general do not seem to realise the value of what they possess until they are stripped of their possessions. We are afraid to try a different way because we are wedded to a particular one. In trying to rally my mental resources I discovered the way to substitute meditation and systematic memorising in place of eyes. In other words I began to see in my head.

"I studied Sanskrit in the old Shastri manner, by rote and by discussions. My knowledge began to increase by leaps and bounds. Soon it became evident that one cannot go on accumulating knowledge without a system to organise it for definite use. How to organise the incoming tide of information was my problem. I needed the discretion to judge and to assimilate.

" That difficulty was solved by the advice of a Sadhu who told me to study Vedanta. I did. I can say from experience that the study of Vedanta is the best organiser of knowledge, because it introduces us to the ultimate measure of all sciences. From Vedanta I was inevitably led to the *Gita* which is Vedanta brought into the business of life. This truth was emphasized in the *Gita-Rahasya*

by Lokamanya Tilak. Tilak showed, against the weight of the orthodox authorities, that the *Gita* is *Pravṛttipara* and not *Nivṛttipara* as the traditional commentators and their orthodox followers made it appear. That is, the teaching of the *Gita* definitely exalts a life of activity for *Lokasangraha* or the well-being of the people."

"But then," I asked, "the general impression is that there are various paths described in the *Gita*. Which of them do you think is *the* path that Krishna definitely advocates?"

"The *Gita* presents at the outset the winding ways of mankind. Good many people recognise the futility of trying to possess everything. So they choose and undergo hardships, follow certain ways calculated to reach their goal. These are the different goods of life—from coarse pleasures to most cultivated pursuits. Krishna says that though one may attain such particular ends in proportion to one's faith and perseverance, yet they are all born of illusion; it makes us forget that their enjoyment is exhaustible and such exhaustion brings disappointment.

"On the other hand the path of the *Gita* is the path to universal intelligence. The *Gita* puts you at the centre of the world rather than at its peripheri. Our passions, petty desires, and general covetousness to own the fruits of our pursuits continuously deflect us from the path of wisdom, and rob us of that calm insight which alone is able to discriminate the really worthwhile from the worthless. If you attain to that stage of discretion, and cultivate a detached attitude towards the enjoyment of the fruits of your conduct, you find yourself free. Then you continue doing the duties of life without getting involved in them. The *Gita* describes in eloquent words the life of true freedom. It posits the life of fruitful activity as against the life of an ascetic. It gives a decided preference to Karma-Yogi or the wise man who walks the ramifying ways of the world in the spirit of divine detachment. He works for the good of all creatures without a desire to possess the fruits for himself. Such a life cannot be lived in the woods. The *Gita* teaches Karma-Yoga or the path of detachment in action."

"You said that the philosophy of the *Gita* is the philosophy of Vedant. Can you tell me whether the *Gita* tries at the same time to reconcile other schools?"

"It takes up other systems of philosophy, shears them of their particular biases and converts them to strengthen its own conclusions. From Yoga it takes parts which are helpful in concentrating and elevating the mind and prescribes them as discipline to the Karma-Yogi. It takes from the Sankhya Philosophy the theory of Purusha and Prakriti to describe the relation between the Self and the not-self. Also it profits itself from the Guna-Vichar or the consideration of qualities which fashion the world of particulars. It considers Bhaktimarga or the path of devotion to direct all activity to the one universal end, instead of appropriating its fruits for the sake of the agent himself. In the Upanishads the Vedanta philosophy is expressed in terms of speculative experiences—you see the heights of philosophy as you may behold from a distance the heights of Himalaya without seeing a possible way to reach them. The result is that these experiences stand isolated from us as ideal moments of an ideal soul, as dreams of another life far different and far difficult for us. But the *Gita* shows in a practical way how to reach those heights in one's own experience. It tells in exact words how to work out that philosophy of Vedanta—the end of all knowledge—in the experience of one's own life."

"Supposing," said I, "one is impressed by the example of the life of Karma-Yogi as described in the *Gita* and wants to reach that ideal—what are the qualifications and virtues which one should practise and how?"

"It is an old story. The *Gita* has a convincing answer. Krishna says that most people live in a state of forgetfulness. They surround themselves with a world of illusion created by the senses which continue to attract them to their particular pleasures. They are not critical. They behave like children beguiled by sense-pleasures. Even in studying the physical world the scientist refuses to take the findings of the senses at their face value. He checks them by a number of devices and verifies the conclusions before admitting their validity. In the spiritual life the senses must be regarded a hundredfold more deceitful. By controlling them, says Krishna, the intelligence is rendered sharp, serene and soul-lifting.

"There is another source of illusion—that created by our covetousness. We desire to possess the enjoyment which the objects give. If one gets rid of the feeling of proprietorship over the fruits of one's pursuits, then, over-coming sins, one passes beyond. To be imbued with this freedom of self from the senses and then to be doing the duties of life in the spirit of sacrifice is the path of Nishkāma Karma, *i. e.*, action without coveting its fruits."

Naturally, the question came uppermost to my mind why such a book with its inspiration and unerring guidance for men should have been lost for centuries. Was it suppressed? How did it remain without touching the minds of people during several centuries? The answer of Bhide Shastri is that the *Gita* was neither lost nor suppressed. On the contrary ever since its appearance over four thousand years ago, it has been among the most revered books of the Hindu religion. But when the wave of ascetic abandon spread over the minds of people the *Gita* fell the first victim. Its teaching was buried under a heap of commentaries. Learned men read into the *Gita* the melancholy spirit of their age and wrote commentaries saying that the *Gita* preached a life of *Sanyāsa* or an ascetic seclu-

sion. They have now started to read the *Gita* in its original and feel once again its eternal urge for action in inaction and inaction in action.

"But then would it not be merely pouring old wine into new bottles? Has the *Gita* any specific message for our generation in India? Supposing the message of the *Gita* has been popularly known during these centuries and practised by the masses, would the story of India be different? Wherein exactly should the *Gita* touch our life to-day? What did the people of India lose in not recognizing its message for so long?"

"Of course," said Bhide Shastri, "the message of the *Gita* is particularly fitting to our present conditions. The *Gita* tells how in the scheme of life the individual and the society should fit in with each other and how man cannot save himself while ignoring his fellows. In the present stage of India when caste is crumbling, and old social limitations are falling under the pressure of circumstances, and when we are once again facing the problem of a new social reconstruction, to my mind the teaching of the Gita points out *the* way to us. It asks you to be wise as an individual and worthwhile as a social being. It points out that the greatest problem in life is to understand the possibilities of one's soul and to utilise them for social well-being, remaining all the while detached from the fruits of one's own conduct. There are limitations in this life which scare us and throw us off our feet. But then, says Krishna, the sacrificial fire has its smoke. Build a fire that has as little smoke, and let it out without being choked by it. A life that is profound as that of a philosopher and yet is keenly alive to the smallest of details in conduct is the life of a *Mukta* or a spiritually free man. In fact the very propriety of the *Gita* was to enlighten Arjuna who, frightened by the duties of a prince, wanted to get away from men and sink into the life of a private individual. Krishna says, you cannot avoid your obligations. On the other hand through a life of deep understanding and detached activity raise the world to the plane of salvation."

"Had we practised the philosophy of the *Gita* India would not have been a conquered country during the last fifteen hundred years, submitting itself to wholesale slavery. It would have been a different story. Our folks would have been freer in their thinking, more courageous in their conduct, more fruitful in their endeavours. The lofty philosophy of India would have had a chance to vindicate itself in the lives of its people. We might have had both the individual and the society progressively uplifting each other."

Our conversation turned on religion and its many symbols in the form of temples and shrines. Do people get any worthwhile religion out of such places? Bhide Shastri believes that these places are useful as reminders which should help to take you bodily into different surroundings at least for the time being. But most people visit these places either as a routine or in the spirit of bargaining. They want to be favoured, to be promoted in their pursuits or to be forgiven for their sins—all of which they hope to get from going to the temples with so many offerings! They are idle and their religion is a kind of make believe. However we do need temples as we need good associations, and for some it is a good practice to visit a temple daily and to meditate there for a few minutes.

According to him India at present is passing through a transition period and people's minds are extremely unsettled. "We have to pass," he said, "through a period of activity—like the period of pioneers in America, or like Europe when it was busy with industrial revolution, building itself anew after the wreckage of the feudal system and the papal religion. Out of this re-making must come *our* philosophy. *We can neither be imitators of the West nor mere borrowers of the ancients.* I feel that our ancient philosophy and culture can give a good start; with that initial experience, leaving authority alone, and trying to find the truth within ourselves, we will be able to work out our own salvation. Then we may be able to contribute something for the rest of the world. To that end it will be necessary that we possess a sharp and self-purified intelligence coupled with a constant endeavour to labour and live in the interest of humanity. Situated as we are under similar conditions the philosophy of the *Gita* can guide us as nothing else can."

It was already late. I thanked Bhide Shastri and took leave of him.

N. B. PARULEKAR

HINDU HERBS

In reference to our introductory note to Mr. H. Stanley Redgrove's review article in April ARYAN PATH in which we ask if some Indian Pandit will write a reliable volume on Indian Herbs-*Aushadhis*, a correspondent sends us the following from H. P. Blavatsky's *Theosophical Glossary*:—

"OSHADI PRASTHA (*Sk.*) *Lit.*, 'the place of medicinal herbs'. A mysterious city in the Himalayas mentioned even from the Vedic period. Tradition shows it as once inhabited by sages, great adepts in the healing art, who used only herbs and plants, as did the ancient Chaldees. The city is mentioned in the *Kumâra Sambhava* of Kalidasa."

RELIGION AND SOCIAL SERVICE

[**Lawrence Hyde** wrote in our January number on "From Authority to Inspiration".

This article discusses a vital problem—socializing of religion. Theology has crushed the mystic element in every creed and has made religion a mockery. Large numbers of people practise religion in social service, and are disappointed; because, their efforts, when not barren, produce but new puzzles and problems. Theosophy is but a religious creed for not a very small number, and they encounter the same disappointment in doing *their* "good works". To them, as to all others who "must rush madly or boldly out *to do, to do,*" the pregnant thought of Mr. Hyde brings a remedy:

"The attempts which are made by the more materialistic thinker to deal with concrete problems without first developing a spiritual consciousness are always doomed to failure."

Our civilization has to learn this lesson—Mere altruistic activity, however laudable, can never take the place of religion which must contain philosophy to satisfy the intellect and purify the emotions, and mysticism to raise thoughts and feelings to the plane of genuine philanthropy.—EDS.]

We are living in an age in which men find themselves confronted with the appalling possibility that the whole structure of their civilization may collapse before their eyes. It is not therefore surprising that the attention of even those people who are normally disinclined to occupy themselves with "serious thought" should to-day be centred upon such subjects as economics, sociology and political science. For, until we have somehow devised a stable material foundation for our communal life it is clearly idle to propose to ourselves more elevated aims.

This unhappy state of affairs is not only presenting a grave problem to the purely secular thinker: it involves also a challenge to the religious believer. For one of the major objects of religion, and of Western religion in particular, is that of realising the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth. And what is actually being realised at the moment is something more appropriate to an infernal régime. Hence we find in modern religious thought a powerful movement towards the "socializing" of Christianity. That it is from one point of view an extremely salutary development is evident enough. But it raises inevitably the whole problem of the relation between social and individual regeneration—a problem with which the majority of those who are working in this field only rarely come definitely to grips.

I

It is clear at the outset that as far as this particular issue goes the intelligent Christian is rightly stricken with a sense of remorse. The dynamic of social reform during the last half century has been provided in a large measure

by people for whom the limited ideal of humanitarianism was infinitely more suggestive than any furnished by religion. In turning his attention to social problems the Christian thinker is for the most part only following a lead which has been given him by those who do not in other respects share his aspirations and beliefs. Further, this re-orientation has been precipitated by another realisation of no less serious import—the realisation that the spiritual life of the ordinary Christian has become somehow inordinately introverted, distinguished by an unattractive piety and religiosity which find no vital expression on the plane of actuality. The type of discipline which has been encouraged by the Churches seems to make for a curious and disappointing disassociation from the world of concrete reality.

The reaction is as healthy as it is inevitable. But at the same time it opens the door, paradoxically enough, to a subtle type of materialism. For the religious thinker who is animated by this desire to get down to "realities" is in serious danger of perverting in the process the proper function of religion. So much so, indeed, that this propagation of the "social gospel" of Christ has already called forth a vigorous counter-affirmation from the theologians of the Barthian school. They insist that in one very important sense religion has absolutely nothing to do with schemes for social reconstruction or with practical measures for reform. Society might conceivably be perfectly organized economically and yet still be disastrously alienated from the Divine. The fundamental problems lie altogether beyond the plane of space and time. The supreme object before us is that of attaining to Eternal Life, which is completely different in quality from our ordinary mundane existence. The world is by its very nature corrupt, unreal, impermanent. Our concern with it is essentially of a secondary order. And so on, in a style which betrays curious affinities with the thought of the East. It is all valuable enough in its way—and would be very much more so were it not inseverably associated with an almost fanatic adherence to an uncompromisingly Christocentric scheme of salvation of an oppressively Protestant type.

II

Nevertheless the stress laid by the Barthian theologians on the element of "otherworldness" in religion is valuable and timely enough. For the progress of modern social reform is bringing out more and more clearly the fact that the attempts which are made by the more materialistic thinker to deal with concrete problems without first developing a spiritual consciousness are always doomed to failure. This comes out in a variety of ways. In the first place, the earnest social reformer is usually basing his activities on an attitude to experience which is known philosophically

as "naïve realism". That is to say, he takes life at its face value, does not pause to enquire why the objects with which he is dealing should exist at all, what ultimate aim, if any, is achieved by perfecting them, or in what relation he himself stands to them. It never occurs to him, for instance, to consider whether it is intrinsically desirable that social conditions should be improved at all; such metaphysical speculations he is apt to dismiss as being idle and far-fetched. The attitude works well enough while it lasts. But there is always the possibility that the individual's zest may one day fail, that all this vehement activity will suddenly and mysteriously lose its savour for him, and that he will pay the penalty which attaches to being of the "once-born" rather than of the "twice-born" type. And inevitably at some point in the course of the soul's evolution this peculiar disillusion and sense of futility must be experienced. *For until the man has found himself within he cannot effectively relate himself to the world without.* In the language of modern psychology, the only sound basis for extraversion lies in an antecedent introversion. Or, in religious terms, the self within must be securely possessed before the spirit can act creatively upon the not-self to which it is opposed.

The truth is that the naïve extravert, for all his apparent "objectivity," is really far more at the mercy of his psychological inhibitions than is the man whose thoughts are turned inwards. A great deal of his material activity, so far from being creative, represents in point of fact the "projection" upon his environment of conflicts which he has failed to resolve within his own being. He is really compensating for a basic disinclination to face the humble and work-a-day, but infinitely more urgent and vital, problems which are presented to him by his intimate, personal life. Hence that curious combination of unhealthy excitement and internal emptiness which is so often engendered by work in this field, and which in the end resolves itself into profound disillusion and depression.

III

Nor is this all. Not only is the individual of this type psychologically bound; he is also notably ineffective—the inescapable nemesis for attacking the problem of social reform at the wrong end. His efforts never seem to produce any really substantial results—as is being forcibly brought home to us to-day by the signal failure of our purely secular thinkers to set our unhappy modern world straight. The person who has not begun by finding his centre in the All One will infallibly lack the inspiration required to solve the material problems with which he is seeking to deal. All his planning, however resourceful and ingenious, will ultimately lead to nothing—for the reason that he is not inwardly attuned to that Universal Mind which is the unique source of all orderly and creative thought.

This, one suspects, is one of the main reasons why all the great spiritual teachers have always stressed the fact that all social regeneration begins with the individual. The point is not simply that an inner quickening of the spirit will increase man's power to do "good" on the level on which he was doing it before. That is, indeed, an important element in the situation. But there is also to be reckoned with the fact that this interior vitalization makes also for a heightening of the natural faculties, and this not only in relation to those more elevated questions which occupy the attention of the spiritually-minded person, but in relation also to the most concrete and objective problems of material life. This is a fact which needs urgently to be emphasized. For it is the common opinion that the awakening of the spiritual faculties in man make pre-eminently for a concern with the more exalted and mystical aspects of being. To be "spiritual" is to be etherealized, contemplative, remote, withdrawn, unsullied by the world. This certainly applies to one very important aspect of the mystic's life; he must constantly retire within for replenishment. Yet it is no less true that in the case of the mystic who expresses himself most characteristically in *action* (who, in terms of Eastern philosophy, is following the path of Karma-Yoga) his spiritual unfoldment will manifest itself before everything in what might be described as a genius for practical reform. He will be able to act socially with infinitely greater discernment than he did before, to take measures which are creative in a far deeper sense than is apparent to the unilluminated eye, to lay down his plans with a sureness and foresight beyond any which are attainable by the person who is dealing with the problem by the light of his native understanding alone. Harmonized with the creative Mind of the Universe, he will necessarily be moved to introduce a basic order and unity into his surroundings.

IV

The fact that the character of the outward and the manifested is determined by the invisible and the spiritual is, however, never properly appreciated by the more rationalistic type of reformer. For he tends always to identify reality with those objects which are presented to him by his physical senses. It is upon them that his thoughts and feelings are primarily centred. He is inordinately preoccupied with the visible aspect of things, and correspondingly insensitive to that elusive and interior world of spiritual being of which it is the outer expression. He may even go so far as to "have no use for" religion, although it does not need much perspicacity to see that the religious attitude of the individual must in the end provide the key to the whole problem. Behind the factory, the research laboratory, the commercial treaty, there is a complex of ideas which provide the matrix

for their physical manifestation. Behind the ideas are a collection, of emotional preferences—for the mind is in this connection an instrument for objectifying the ideals which the soul has found acceptable. And behind these ideals again is the spiritual attitude of the individual—that which renders him responsive to this ideal, apathetic to that.

It is upon this ultimate attitude of the soul that the specific influences of religion are directed—so that in the last analysis it is upon religion that all else depends. But to live up to this realisation is for the majority of men extremely difficult. Their imagination and will-power are liable to falter unless they can maintain before their minds some visible and concrete objective such as those which are provided for them by the scientist, the eugenist, the sociologist and the politician. Those subtle but potent influences which work within the depths of the spirit seem to them to be too insubstantial and evasive to have any vital function in transforming reality; they are too impatient to accept the notion that the foundation of the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth should be laid in the last resort by the solution of an infinity of minor, private, domestic problems of a wearisome and seemingly insignificant order. Yet it is precisely in terms of such apparently trivial situations that the individual is spiritually educated, and the process is all the more arduous because it provides no basis either for that sensationalism on which the soul of the average reformer so eagerly feeds, or for the contemplation of chimerical and grandiose vistas. Instead the individual is called upon to leave his appetite for facile emotions unsatisfied, to live upon dry bread, and to build slowly and unobtrusively in the silence. Yet this, as the wise have always insisted, is the only sure foundation for the regeneration of Society.

LAWRENCE HYDE

It takes a very wise man to do good works without danger of doing incalculable harm; one such might by his great intuitive powers know whom to relieve and whom to leave in the mire that is their best teacher. The poor and wretched themselves will tell anyone who is able to win their confidence what disastrous mistakes are made by those who come from a different class and endeavour to help them. Kindness and gentle treatment will sometimes bring out the worst qualities of a man or woman who has led a fairly presentable life when kept down by pain and despair. The Gita teaches that the causes of misery do not lie in conditions or circumstances, but in the mistaken ideas and actions of the man himself; he reaps what he has sown in ignorance. A better knowledge of the nature of man and the purpose of life is needed; as this is acquired, the causes of misery are gradually eliminated. No greater charity can be bestowed upon suffering humanity than right knowledge that leads to right action.

—ROBERT CROSBIE (*Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita*, pp. 221-222)

FREE WILL IN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

[**Prof. G. R. Malkani** is already known to our readers. Last month in publishing Prof. C. E. M. Joad's "Free Will and Modern Psychology" we promised the Hindu view-point, on the subject of fate and free-will. Next month we will publish an interesting consideration of the same subject by Mr. J. D. Beresford who examines the views of some prominent men of science.—EDS.]

It is sometimes supposed that Hindoo thought does not favour the freedom of the will. But this is a mistake. The freedom of the will is not only an ethical postulate with the Hindoos, based on an analysis of ethical facts; it is directly deducible from their metaphysics or their view of Reality as Spirit. *The spirit is essentially free; it is freedom itself; and if something appears to determine it and involve it in the cycle of cause and effect, the spirit is competent to counteract that something and escape from the cycle.* In fact nothing can *determine* spirit except through its own assent. This assent can be given as well as withdrawn. In embodied existence of the spirit, we naturally find that this assent is given to the body and the bodily cravings. The spirit is so far bound. It is determined. This bondage of the body is the cause of all its unhappiness. Still it is a bondage that is self-imposed; and it is the goal of every spiritual being to remove this bondage, and realize its true natural freedom. Almost all systems of Indian thought therefore consider the highest goal of the spirit to consist in a final escape from the cycle of birth and death, in short, from all embodied existence which is synonymous with pain.

Schopenhauer has much in common with Indian thought. Still there is an important difference. For Schopenhauer blind and unconscious will is the driving power of life. It is the creative force in nature. It is the ultimate reality. According to Indian thought, this blind will itself can only be operative under the influence of what may be called cosmic ignorance. We find in individual life that the will operates only under the idea that something is good and something is bad. Things appear good and bad because there is the false notion that happiness comes from them. This false notion arises because of our identification with the body through which alone we are related to the things. Thus we find that the driving power of the will comes from the erroneous idea that we are the body and that the body is our self. Ultimately, it is this ignorance that alone accounts for those operations of the blind will which constitute the greatest bondage and the source of all unhappiness for the spirit, which in itself is quite free. The ultimate reality is spirit, and its only bondage is ignorance.

But although ignorance is the ultimate cause of all our unhappiness, it does not account for the actual suffering of each separate individuality. What accounts for this is individual Karma, or the sum-total of past actions. Our present existence with all its handicaps and opportunities is the result of our past actions. The question might arise, what made the past? The answer is that the past was made by an earlier past, and so on *ad infinitum*. Evidently then there can be no beginning to Karma. It is said to be *anādi* or beginningless.*

The spirit is in and by nature free. Its bondage is the bondage of desire, *i. e.*, the result of past actions or Karma. True freedom can only be realised through release from Karma. This release comes from enlightenment. It is indeed often thought that knowledge by itself is not sufficient to make us free. We must act rightly. The will must be in accord with our knowledge. But it will be found that the will in the end is governed by knowledge. If we sometimes act against our better judgment or choose what we perceive to be the lesser good, it is only because our understanding is still clouded. If we have a clear perception of a certain course of action to be of greater advantage to ourselves, we cannot but will that course. On the other hand, if we know that a course of action is positively detrimental to us, we can never deliberately choose it. Nobody ever puts his hand in fire, knowing that it will burn.

The will is free in the measure of our knowledge. What we do blindly and thoughtlessly, we do impelled by desire and the momentum of habit. We do not know what we do. We cease to be really alive. We are possessed by inertia. We have no spontaneity and no freedom. We are no longer creative. It is knowledge or enlightenment that releases power in the individual, removes from life the shackles of habit and inertia, and makes for greater freedom. It has indeed to be admitted that this clear understanding of things is not possible unless we have passed through the crucible of action, made bad choices, suffered their fruit, and seen things for ourselves. But action without knowledge is blind. It is knowledge alone that will ultimately make us free. *What is called training of the will is nothing but intelligent persuasion through discriminative thinking. The power in action that comes from knowledge goes to work with the same ease with which water flows to a lower level.* We wrongly identify the greater power of the will with greater strain and effort. It is just the opposite. The man of power is perfectly self-possessed. He is at peace with himself. He does things most easily and naturally.

The law of Karma does not mean, as it is sometimes interpreted to mean, inexorable fate. Fate

* Avidya also is said to be *anādi*. How far this answer is satisfactory has been considered by me in a book on *Ajnana* or *Ignorance* which is now in the press.

is indeed real and inexorable, but only as it has been made by us in the past. The chains that bind us are the chains that we ourselves have made. But what we can make, we can also unmake. We are free in the present. The future is not determined by the past. It is determined by the present. Indeed we cannot be absolutely free in the present. Absolute freedom is the goal to be achieved and not a present fact. We are free only to modify and direct the course of destiny. Each individual is born in certain circumstances over which, it seems, he has no control. His education, his bringing up, his whole environment are more or less determined for him. Still he has a real choice, when he is not wholly submerged under the forces of desire and of past tradition. It may be a restricted freedom, the freedom of opportunity; nevertheless it is real. The past is no longer ours. But we possess the present, and also the future in so far as it is contained in the present. It is wrong to suppose that we are wholly determined, and can do nothing to change what the so called fate has ordained for us.

It has been said that it is necessary for freedom of choice that the elimination of past influences should be sometimes achieved. But we do not think that such elimination is possible, or even that it is desirable. But for the past history of the individual, there will be no continuity of growth. Growth involves conservation as well as transformation. A mere freakish choice will have no relation to our personality; it will be quite useless. There is no value in a free choice if it cannot be worked into our personality and made a part of it. *What thus seems to hamper freedom through the determining force of the past is found to be a way to real freedom.*

A choice once made cannot be revoked. We shall have to suffer the fruit. But this suffering cannot be endless. When we have gone through the suffering that is appropriate to the moral quality of our act, we are no longer bound by the original choice. We have paid for it in our lives. Our new choice is comparatively free. The suffering has chastened and unbound us. It has prepared us for a freer choice. Suffering is the only means to wisdom, and so to freedom. It has a great spiritual value. It would be monstrous to suppose that the punishment of our deeds which awaits us will be eternal, without any hope of redemption. Eternal and endless punishment is not only psychologically impossible, but ethically barbarous and unjustifiable. Once we have paid for the deed in suffering, we are free.

There is indeed the possibility of bad choices leading to renewed bad choices, and good choices leading to renewed good choices. It is for such cases, seasoned sinners and seasoned saints, that heaven and hell have been invented. Slight deviations from the path of righteousness do not need strong measures of correction.

But *the hue of our character is a more permanent thing*; hence the notion of a comparatively permanent abode of correction or of enjoyment. But no one can be said to be lost for ever. Nor can any one be said to have got redemption till he has become completely desireless.

This brings us to the great ethical distinction between the ideals of the East and the ideals of the West. It is often a charge levelled against the East by Western thinkers that its ethics is negative. The thinkers of the East on the other hand regard Western ideals of morality as simply leading to what is called more *samsara* or a worldly kind of existence. An action is judged highest in Hindoo philosophy, when it is performed without any desire for fruit whatsoever. Such an act is a truly free act. It does not bind the agent. An action, on the other hand, is judged highest in the West when it serves the highest purpose. But since no one has ever any clear idea as to what is the highest purpose, it is enough if a certain course of action satisfies the ethical conscience or the traditional code of morality. The ten commandments of the Old Testament and the ethical teaching of the New Testament set the standard. As against this we find in the *Gita* an actual injunction to Arjuna to fight the battle in accordance with his *Sva-dharma*, but only to do so without any desire for fruit. The highest excellence in action is the complete desirelessness with which it is performed. Thus an apparently sinful act can be a most free act; while on the other hand an apparently moral act may still be a shackle upon the spirit.

It is often thought that freedom involves creativeness. Creativeness means in general "bringing something into being which did not exist before". In a sense, all forms of higher activity in which a choice is made after a dispassionate consideration of the principles involved, are creative. One is conscious of freely bringing something into being. But creativeness is often understood in a more radical sense. It is the sense in which blind and unconscious will was supposed by Schopenhauer to be creative and God is supposed in Christian tradition to have created the world. But even then one thing is certain. The divine act may be truly creative; but what is created can never have a real and independent existence. The act is free, but not what it brings about. The latter can only have a dependent existence. What the will can make out of its freedom, it can also unmake. It is free both to put forth as well as to withdraw. It is wrong to attribute one-sided activity to it. It creates and also destroys. It is this dual activity that truly proves the freedom of the spirit. The latter is not bound by what it has once created. It can also destroy. Hindoo philosophy thus attributes to Deity not only the creative function, but also the sustaining and the destroying functions, thereby demonstrating its complete freedom in respect of the world which it itself has made.

The freedom of the will must be distinguished from the freedom of the spirit. What is truly and absolutely free is the spirit. The exercise of this freedom under certain limiting conditions is what we understand by the freedom of the will. These limiting conditions can ultimately be traced simply to desire. It is evident that will is not desire, though desire is certainly implied in it. We may desire something, but not will it. But when we will we cetainly also desire. With will is associated the notion of "power to bring about what is desired". In a sense power is inalienable from reality; and will is simply the actual functioning of this power. The exercise of this power, in the case of the individual, is dependent upon the circumstances in which he finds himself placed and in which there is a call for him to act. The supreme spirit is not thus externally determined. It is not conditioned by any circumstances outside itself. It makes its own circumstances. Still it is determined from within in that, that there can be no occasion for the exercise of its power unless there is desire. "I want to be many," "I want to show myself forth," etc., these are some of the forms of divine desire.* The freedom of the will is thus necessarily conditioned freedom. It is not absolute freedom which belongs to the spirit only. The exercise of freedom is bound up with a thinking appreciation of things. There must be thought and there must be evaluation. Where both thought and values are transcended, there can be no scope for the exercise of freedom. The spirit is freedom itself. The freedom of the will is subordinate to it; it is the lower freedom that in the words of Hindoo thought has scope only within the realm of *avidya*.

G. R. MALKANI

Karma is the adjustment of effects flowing from causes, during which the being upon whom and through whom that adjustment is effected experiences pain or pleasure.

Karma is an undeviating and unerring tendency in the Universe to restore equilibrium, and it operates incessantly.

—Aphorisms 2 and 3 on Karma. W. Q. JUDGE
(*Overcoming Karma*, U. L. T. Pamphlet—No. 21)

* H. P. Blavatsky's *Theosophical Glossary* under Kamadeva.—EDS.

THE PROBLEM OF THE 'MAN' AS BECOMING

[**Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids**, the great authority on Pali texts and Buddhistic lore concludes her fascinating study of how soul-unfoldment was understood, in the era when Sakyamuni began His Mission, taking up the thread of the elder Upanishads. We heartily endorse our author's concluding appeal for the restoration in modern Buddhism of the true concept of Man, the Soul, which the Buddha must have taught.

The Esoteric Science has its own explanation about the real Upanishadic lore, how its knowledge was acquired by the Buddha, and what transpired thereafter—the struggle between the Brahmana-orthodoxy and Buddhism. Readers will find that pp. 271-2 of *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, throw great light on the subject. —EDS.]

II

It is hardly to be wondered at, that we outside readers have failed to see as yet, something that was pressing for utterance, pressing between the years B. C. 600 to 500. Can we now light upon that 'something' in the world of religious ideas and aspirations?

I surely think we can; thus: In this new preference for forms of the word 'become,' when the older, or at least more usual 'be' would have sufficed, we are not merely concerned with an attempt to express some social, political, ethical or even philosophical change in North India. We are up against a religious change, and one of the deepest significance. In those early Upanishads we find ourselves in a world of teachers who are profoundly convinced of the truth in a new mandate, a mandate *not originally* put forward by them—the name of the man who did that is alas! not one that "liveth for evermore"—but which they are exercising their imagination about, developing, amplifying, vindicating.

This new mandate was, that man has it in his nature, by becoming more, to "become That" Who he essentially is. At present he is far from actually being It. They had no word for 'potential,' —*we* owe that to Aristotle—or they would probably have used it. At first the teaching was, that to be as (*iva*), God, man had to 'know' this essential unity of nature. This, if it seem feeble to us, is because for us the idea of 'knowing' (involving what we now call 'will'*) was a very tremendous thing for the early Indian mind.

But there seems to emerge a feeling after something to endorse and vitalize the 'knowing'. To express this, there was the word *vardh*, meaning quantitative increase as growth and this was in a way not good enough. We do meet much with it in the Pali scriptures, work largely of later wording, and with other words too for growth: *virūḷhi*, *vepulla*, derived from the plant world. But in those scriptures the greater

* I mean that 'knowing' included 'purpose'.

stronger word 'become,' *bhava*, was undergoing a very chequered history, and therein becoming worsened. No such rebuff had yet befallen the word *bhū*, *bhava* in the earlier Upanishads. It was, as applied to the very man, new, for the idea of the very real as just 'being' has ever dominated the Indian, both before this period and since. But just then a stirring had come in these static waters, and for 'being' there was a tendency to substitute 'movement-in-being'.

This was in a way forced upon them by the tremendous religious change from the conception of Deity, as external to man, to immanent Deity. For man to conceive himself, not as only creature of Deity, not even as son of Deity, but as in his bed-rock nature, very Deity there must go, with this terrific act of faith, an imperious sense of the need in him to be growing less unlike That of whom he is but at the best a tender shoot. The one attitude that can possibly justify the faith is the sister-faith, that he can become, become to an unlimited degree, and the *confession of the will to become.* So may we, in a long perspective of time, interpret the reason of this preoccupation with 'becoming' in those brahman teachers.

Or do you say: Was not then and there the idea of the Highest, the Perfect so far lower, cruder than it became later, that identity of nature with Deity was more plausible than it would now be? I would reply, that in the early Upanishads those lower cruder conceptions of Deity, such as we find, not in a primitive degree, but to a relatively un-moral degree in the Vedas, have been discarded. Previous to our date Zarathustra had lived and taught in Persia, taught a morally lofty conception of Deity as the Good word, Good deed, Good thought, and, by ways of which we have no clear record this New Word had infected Indian religious thought, leaving both a general uplift and other traces in Upanishadic and early Buddhist teaching. In the brahman books, God, *i. e.* Brahman, was conceived as eternal wisdom, truth, happiness, dearness, steadfastness:—terms in which an approximately perfect man of that day would be described. (And in the Buddhist Suttas we come up continually against the triad of good or bad deed, word and thought. Nor is the supposedly perfect man conceived in any but equally lofty terms.)

It is not, I think, by narrowing the tremendous gap between the Highest and the earthly human self, that we shall rightly value the Upanishad teaching. The fact that the gap was, if not worded, felt, and that to bridge it remained a practical task, let alone a problem,*—this it is that we must keep in view. Teachers told their hearers: Thou art That, meaning that *au fond* and ultimately man's nature is God's

* So Prof. S. Radhakrishnan: "The God-in-man was a task as well as a problem." —*Studies in the Upanishads.*

nature. How man was to make the potential actual was variously taught, but there were neither these terms, nor a word for the tremendous *responsibility* involved in the teaching. Nor do I want to force modern ideas into a teaching in which are no adequate words for those ideas. But I contend that new ideas *may arise when there is a lack of fit words*; when there are only words which old ideas have evolved. And I contend, that one such new idea was the sense that to know one's innate unity with the Divine, even in the Indian meaning of the verb, was being felt (if not so worded) as not enough; and that the importance of living the 'known' was stirring the teachers. And so, whereas in the Upanishads, the vital importance of knowing, of coming-to-know man's oneness with the Highest finds full and varied expression, and indeed conveys a will-power foreign to our term, the yet more vital importance of so living, that he is ever becoming a less glaring inconsistency with himself-as-what-he-may-be is, because it was new, far less clearly worded. It is only, I repeat, *felt after* in this: that a man 'is' only in so far as he 'becomes'.

But that this feeling-after was no more after-thought to be played with you can see if you ponder the passages where it attains deepest significance. This is where Becoming is seen as an attribute of Deity Itself-in-action, in creation. Here we find not just the fiat uttered: "Let there be," or become . . . We find the Divine Artist Himself as becoming. Oneness is—poetically no doubt—felt as unsufficing:—"Let me bring forth Myself." It sought from being One to become many; till this was accomplished, It did not "become this and that":—here we get *bhū* as a compound with the disintegrating prefix *vi*: *na vyabhavat*: 'did not develop'. Becoming is here no longer a state of progress from a more imperfect to a less imperfect, as in the potential or actual becoming of the human self. It is raised to the higher level which we see anticipated in the work of such a man as we call a genius. Becoming is in such to be rather described as a becoming-other, a becoming a new manifold, as it were in divine play. And this, at a much later date, was the very way in which the Indian thinker regarded divine operations, as when Rāmānuja dedicates his Commentary to that "highest Brahman . . . who in play produces, sustains and reabsorbs the entire universe".

At that later date, it is true, the earlier idea of Deity Itself becoming over and in Its creating had been repudiated. But in those earlier days it had been a bold word, in which man was seeing, in the Highest as then conceived, the best and noblest that he saw in himself, as something of which he was, at least ultimately, capable and heir. And more: not only would he, as essentially one with Deity, become, as was That, immortal: his becoming would not stop there

and then.

I mention the word 'immortal,' because we see the teaching in the Upanishads struggling to make it man's birthright, but hindered by the older tradition, which taught that man must win that right, not then held as innate, by sacrifice and ritual while on earth, and by vicarious rites after he had left earth. No phrase is more frequent than "the mortal becoming immortal" in these books (and here at least no translator can shirk the word!). Bold here too was the new teaching, undermining one great claim made by brahmans to the monopoly of the ritual. Yet was the new teaching consistent, if we concede the force there will have been in the word 'become'. Where the teacher might have said: "Man, mortal as to his body, is, as very man, immortal,' he said "Man becomes immortal," because in him, 'being' *is* 'becoming'. Had he used the future tense (*bhavishyati*), we might have hesitated, and seen only a statement of future happening. But it is the present that is used, and for it our English translators should rightly have availed themselves of the more plastic English form and put: "The immortal *is becoming* immortal."

Here again I do not wish to stress unduly. There may have been a concession to tradition in the "become," as a state conditional on sacrifice performed. None the less am I convinced, that we have, in these great books, strata of teaching revealing at once the prophet and the priest, distinct much as in Israel they were distinct, that is, as wording the new and as not wording it respectively. Word of prophet was suffered to survive (so far as it has survived), but the mantra of the priest survived also. And possibly the 'priest' who was not also a prophet, was content with the accepted 'magic' of 'coming-to-know,' and its sufficiency in the concept 'Thou art That'. Hence, it may be, is it why we get no 'Thou art becoming That'. And priest-, not prophet-born, may be, was the reaction against Becoming which we can see creeping up in the middle Upanishads, and then worded as a contention that had come and was now past.

Thus in the Maitri Upanishad we find a hedging on the idea of creation. The Creator here (*a*) "broods upon Himself," (*b*) "thinks: Let Me enter..." (*c*) "utters"... (here resembling the Hebrew idea). Yet the Way of Becoming lingers still strongly. *Bhava* is actually an *epithet of Deity*; and "God is to be praised in becoming," and again: "This One became threefold, eightfold, etc.". In the probably just earlier Śvetāśvatara, creation is not touched upon, but still the man, when he "sees the very Self, becomes unitary, end-won, griefless". In one line it departs from the earlier way of reckoning time in terms of becoming: "the has been, the is becoming, the will be(come)"; it terms the future "what the Vedas tell". But it may be that metre was here the rudder that guided

the ship.

It is when we turn to Ishā and Māṇḍūkya Upanishads, which are probably later than either of these two,* that we see as implicit, that this matter of 'being' versus 'becoming' had been a battle-cry in religious debate, 'becoming' being now termed *sambhūti*, a word not found before. Becoming is now reduced to mean, not exercise of an ever new Manifold in that which is, but as an originating from what was not. This is not the same thing and involves a complement of decay and ending: a limitation of 'becoming' to merely material things, to physical growth. It is true that in the Ishā text we find that man in becoming wins the Goal. But in the Māṇḍūkya the self-contradicting Ishā is purged at the fearful cost of 'becoming' in the very man being voted to be an illusion. And this conviction, that becoming must needs be followed by decay, is the weapon we find used, round about B.C. 230, by the newer as prevailing over the older teaching in Buddhism.

That the bogey of decay as involved in becoming somehow intruded was not without a cause; and I suggest it was from a double cause. I see in these middle Upanishads a new interest in the structure and functions of the body, which came to be so marked a feature in early Buddhism. We find this in the Kaṭha, Śvetāśvatara and Maitri Upanishads. And I seem to see herein a cultural evolution which is the reverse to our own. With us it was physiology that stimulated, indeed almost gave birth to our new psychology. Our first psychologists were mainly doctors. But in India it may well have been the new interest in the processes of the mind, viewed as distinguishable from the self or man, started by one Kapila, which gave rise to analysis of body as important, not for physicians only, but also for religion. And this contemplation of bodily parts and processes would tend to preoccupy men with decay as inevitably supervening on growth or becoming.

In the second place, it may have been the very fertility in the idea of becoming that led to the same result. Indian teaching is steeped in parable and simile, and you cannot get far in the idea of becoming without hitching the notion to parallels in physical becoming or growth. We see this in the *bhū*-forms being equated by *vuddhi* in the Buddhist records, text and commentary, and in the constant use of 'fruit' for result or effect. And as the identity of Divine Spirit or Self with human spirit died out in Buddhism, the spiritual significance of man's 'becoming' would get worsened too, and the term inseparably bound up with the term 'decay'.

It was all perhaps the inevitable result of a mighty idea planning too high in the Unknown, lacking working contact with the facts of

*Maitri only (apparently) quotes Ishā in appendices.

life. "He who knows Brahman becomes as (or just) Brahman,*": here stood the teaching when the Sakyamuni began his mission. And for the earnest but critical hearer it may then have been felt baffling as it may now. "How," asks my friend, Edmond Holmes, in appreciating this great Indian idea "does he become It? Is the transformation immediate, or effected through a process? Does the knowledge as such transform one's being, or does it initiate a process which leads to a transformation, which in its turn reacts on this knowledge and makes it "real," instead of merely notional?" To subtle and searching questions like these the Sakyan Teacher was little called upon to devote his thought. His waiting world was less that of the intelligentsia than was that of the brahman teacher; it was mainly that of Everyman. And to that world his mandate was: "Seek after the Self!"† but not by the yea or nay, by the 'as if' or 'as if not' of dialectic in things we cannot yet understand. Live in the way you hold most worthy; so persisting you are already becoming a More toward That. Trace out the 'track,' the *mṛga*, *marga*, that is your Becoming-in-living. Ever thereby is the separation narrowing; ever thereby is the time when you will know the how, when, where, drawing nearer. In vital becoming lies your coming to know.

Thus it was in a world, where the idea of man's bridging the gulf between Deity and man by the notion of a long Way of Becoming had been felt after, but was faltering, a world, that is, of the cultured few, that the Founder of what came to be known as Buddhism arose and brought out that message to the many. Among the many the idea of man as being able to become a wonderful More would be only just emerging, as fruit of much teaching to the few. But meanwhile a new way of bridging the wide gap had been springing up. This was what is understood under the term Yoga, as complement and opposite of Sānkhya, terms which may very roughly be defined as intellectual knowing and volitional effort; a specializing, so to speak, in the large early comprehensiveness of the words for mind: *manas*, *cetas*. We find them first emerging in the Śvetāśvatara Upanishad: "Him . . . attainable by Sānkhya-Yoga, by knowing the God." It was especially the latter method as an exercise, a willed process, "uniting, joining," which had, as its avowed object, a bringing the human self nearer to its divine ideal and counterpart: "my Kinsman, won to evenness and unity with Whom I become really he who I am." Literally a mechanical idea as compared with the essentially biological idea of Becoming, its stress for the Indian mind lay more in the effort, the toil, that being 'yoked' suggests, and the concentration therein, than any external bringing to-

*Muṇḍaka Up.
†Vinaya, Matravagga.

gether. And Yoga did good service in Indian religion.

We shall find it emerging in early Buddhism with a distinctive use it did not have in Brahman teaching. This is because the former teaching was, as the latter was not, in labour-pains over the fellowman. This must never be forgotten; it is a mighty complication in the religious problem. Man was giving birth to the vision of religion as meaning for each, not only the realizing of God more intensively, but also as bringing in a realizing more intensively who 'the other man' is. But just as in the Stoic and the Christian ideal, the ethical ideal was a corollary following from the idea of God, so should we be prepared to see, that the expanded values about the fellowman in early Indian Buddhism are a corollary following from the expanded teaching of Becoming which its birth signified. This I have dealt with elsewhere.

Here I have sought, I believe in a new way, to show that the New Word, brought to his country by Gotama Sakyamuni, was not a reversal of that country's best religious teaching, but the effort to make it a living religion for every man and woman. It is for me a grievous error to make him out as essentially a Protestant, a Dissentient, a Non-conformist, a man who was out to form a Set, a Party, a Cult, a Church. Protestant he was in this and that; all sound Catholics are that sort of Protestants. But that was in his pulling up weeds; his main work was in training a tender shoot of a wonderful plant so that following on the work of preparation done just before his time in India, it might 'become' what there was in it to become. To the extent that the very 'man' in Buddhism has been damned, his work has been frustrated. If and when, in Buddhism, the very 'man' will be revived, he will not for Buddhism have lived and taught in vain.

C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS

"Considering now, brother Yamaka, that you fail to make out and establish the existence of the Saint in the present life, it is reasonable for you to say: Thus do I understand the doctrine taught by the Blessed One, that on the dissolution of the body the monk who has lost all depravity is annihilated, perishes, and does not exist after death?"

"'Brother Sâriputta, it was because of my ignorance that I held this wicked heresy; but now that I have listened to the doctrinal instruction of the venerable Sâriputta, I have abandoned that wicked heresy and acquired the true doctrine.'"

—*Samyutta-Nikaya* (WARREN) p. 141

THE CHAOS OF MODERN PSYCHOLOGY

[**J. D. Beresford** writes this Note and makes a most valuable suggestion: Who will write the book?—EDS.]

Psychology as we know it in the schools can be classified under three heads. The first of these includes all that classical psychology, which was treated in its relation to philosophy. The second which did not find a name until some thirty years ago, is still described as "the New Psychology," and represents the scientific attempt to analyse the personality in the laboratory or classroom by such criteria as reaction tests. Under the third head, we range all that material deriving originally from the work of Freud, however variously developed by Jung and Adler, to name only the two principal modern schools.

The first of these psychologies can be briefly dismissed. It was essentially *a priori* founded on premises that assumed man to be a fairly simple composite of soul and body. In its development it took such extreme forms as solipsism, the assertion that "all existence is experience and there is only one experient," or Kant's belief in the integrity of things in themselves, but its instruments were solely those of introspection and logic, and neither experiment nor, in the scientific sense, observation was considered as a necessary or even an available method for the philosopher.

The New Psychology represented the scientific reaction against all forms of *a priorism*. It developed as one consequence of the late nineteenth century revolution in favour of accumulating measureable and classifiable data by observation; and attempted in the first instance to get together a body of significant material. But failure to give any true account of the mainspring of action was implicit in the main assumptions. We might as well seek to account for the life and nature of a plant by observations of its growth in different surroundings or by experiments in the effects of light, humidity and soil. Nevertheless, the New Psychology did at least arrive at certain generalisations with regard to behaviour that are proving useful in connection with industrial conditions. This is certainly a very small contribution to knowledge, for a study that by definition deals with the soul; but it was undertaken in the first place long before the frank modern admission that science has no concern with a first cause, which is by hypothesis outside the reach of scientific methods.

The third type of psychology has no real relation to the other two. It arose almost exclusively from the work of one man, not as a philosophy nor as an academic investigation into the causes of human reactions, but as a clinical treatment in the cure of hysteria, depending primarily on the assumption of a kind of second self

within that commonly displayed, and labelled by Freud "the Unconscious". This designation, like most of Freud's, was an unfortunate one, but he was a doctor, not a philosopher, his terms were merely convenient symbols, and "psycho-analysis," the "unconscious" or the "endo-psychic censor" were never intended by him to convey more than does any other medical terminology.

Now there were two main reasons why psycho-analysis took such a strong hold on the public imagination. The first of these was this open postulation of the "unconscious" self. It was not new, Janet and the Salpêtrière school, for instance, had already done a lot of work on it in connection with hypnotism. But Freud's method lifted it out of the abnormal classification, and the general state of modern Western knowledge was ready to recognise the evident, *superficial* truth that we are constantly swayed by, and may in some cases be at the mercy of, inclinations and impulses, sometimes finding expression in action, which do not enter the awareness of the self commonly regarded as the representative personality. Also, in the same relation, psycho-analysis provided in some sort an explanation for the age-old mystery of dreams, some at least of which could be traceable, once the symbolism was recognised, to the partial liberation of thoughts on subjects that are repressed in waking life.

The second reason for the popular interest in psycho-analysis was largely pragmatical and need not detain us here. The bare fact is that the method had a practical and useful application not only in the cure of hysteria, but in the recognition of psychological types and in the explanation of behaviour that from the point of view of orthodox psychology would be regarded as abnormal.

Beyond all this, however, psycho-analysis has an interest to the student of occultism in that it represents a real advance in psychological method. On the one hand, all the old premises have been not so much swept away as completely disregarded. On the other, although it may in one sense be described as scientific, and in the hands of some of its professors is fairly strictly confined to scientific method, its study outside the clinic may be conducted on the lines of philosophy, and pushed far beyond the limits laid down by practical experiment.

We might, for instance, begin an enquiry on these lines by postulating that most of the inferences of psycho-analysis and indeed of all the psychologies commonly so called, start from a false assumption with regard to the self. Working as they do from the outside inwards, modern psychologists have begun by presuming that the self is the personality recognised in ordinary consciousness as more or less truly representing the Ego; and have proceeded from that to diagnose the "unconscious" as a secondary personality, sometimes beneficent, sometimes inimical,

aiding or confuting this primary self. But it would be perhaps permissible in this connection, to assume that the unconscious, though it is not in itself the "ego," is the intermediary between that and the largely automatic creature that plays its part in the physical world.

To the scientist this suggestion would appear as wholly subversive of his method, which is and must always be strictly inductive. The philosopher would refuse it on the ground that it begs the essential question. But Science, as its exponents admit, is useless to us in this great investigation; and philosophy of the academic type continually turns in upon itself and is of value for the training of the mind rather than for any solution it can ever hope to give us to the riddle of Being. Wherefore, though we might later demonstrate the Truth of our assumption by recourse to acceptable evidence on the intellectual plane, we must in the first instance claim the inspired writings of certain Occultists as the authority for our premises, and boldly disavow that of Science, or the various psychologies that have hitherto been attempted.

By way of qualification, however, it must be admitted that to the older, philosophical psychologists this proposal of starting with the main assumption of an immortal influencing principle, would appear perfectly rationable. A belief in the "soul" was implicit in practically all the older writings. But Freud's "unconscious" self was known to them solely in its more perversive manifestations, and was doubtless often regarded as evidence of possession by an evil spirit. The psychologists had no need, therefore, to account for it as a necessary and exceedingly interesting element in the human economy, and by that omission lost one of the necessary keys to understanding and vitiated most of their conclusions.

I have been led to make this brief and insufficient analysis of the general study of psychology by reflection on the chaotic state in which that study exists to-day, and further upon the value that a truly enlightening psychology would have upon the general tendency of Western thought. At present there is no meeting ground for the deductive and inductive methods for those who posit the "soul" as the motive force of action and those who have failed to infer it by their study of human behaviour.

The former class fail deplorably to give any account of the phenomena whether abnormal or not, because their conception of the ego corresponds to no reality. Their idea of the "soul" in the majority of cases is a vague abstraction of what they regard as the moral quantities. It is postulated as being essentially good, and for them goodness consists in some kind of summation of Western ethics. In fact, this immortal principle of their theory is but a sublimation of the physical personality deprived of carnal lusts and appetites, a figure that

corresponds with the twin ideal of an anthropomorphic God. And nowhere does the conception touch or explain the valid deductions of modern psychology as to the functions of the "unconscious," being as remote from present day observations in this connection as medieval theory with regard to the stars is from the present findings of mathematical physics.

It would be impossible in such an article as this to indicate more than the broad lines on which such a psychology as that I am suggesting should proceed. The writer of it must be one who has a reasonably full acquaintance with the wisdom of the East, with Madame Blavatsky's writing on the subject and the position of the genuine Theosophical knowledge at the present time. But his immediate object in this connection would be not to proclaim that knowledge as inspired, but to make such use of it as would explain beyond confutation the phenomena recognised in psychotherapy or industrial psychology as sufficiently well demonstrated in common practice. The writer's aim in this part of the undertaking should be in effect so nearly scientific in principle as to carry conviction to the logical mind. He would provide the ideal theory that covers all the facts, with the fewest possible assumptions, and on that ground would compel the attention of a very great number of intelligent people who at present are either ignorant or contemptuous of Theosophical teaching in the respect. Beyond that he would be unable to confirm and range the valuable material, —of which there is much, though the greater part of it was not fully realised by the authors themselves, —in the classical psychologies from Locke onwards, clarifying in the process their terminologies not less than their precepts.

Personally, I have a complete confidence that this book could be written and do all and far more than I have here suggested, by one who had the necessary equipment. In many small and comparatively unimportant ways I, myself, have tested the main principle, applying occult explanations to the phenomena recorded in works on modern psychology and realising that the problems involved tend to become simpler and more easily classifiable. One aspect of this application may be found in my two papers that appeared in THE ARYAN PATH last year on the subject of Automatism. My contentions as there set out do, in fact, reverse the order of importance commonly accepted by psychologists of the conscious and the "unconscious". For them the essential self is the known personality and the "unconscious" self, although many extraordinary powers are rightly attributed to it, is regarded as the automaton. Indeed all theories of suggestion and auto-suggestion rest ultimately upon this conception and it is for this reason that despite the occasional brilliant, and as some people regard them, miraculous successes of "faith" cures, the

principle fails to have effect in the great majority of cases.

Finally I wish to emphasise my belief that such a work as I have proposed would serve a very valuable purpose. There are, within my own experience, an immense number of intelligent people in Western Europe who recognise the significance of modern psychological knowledge and the strange if intermittent illumination that it throws on the mystery of Being; but who fail for various reasons to realise the true relation of this purely intellectual knowledge to themselves. For them the essential key to self-understanding is still lacking because they never question nor find in their teachers, any authority for questioning, the validity of the superficial personality they build up throughout life. To such people the kind of work I have here suggested, would prove a great stimulus to set about the work of self-examination, and I believe that a proportion of them would thereby be set on the right way towards that increase of consciousness which the followers of psycho-analysis dimly apprehend as the goal of their ambition, but do nothing whatever to further by their practice.

J. D. BERESFORD

Between man and the animal . . . there is the impassable abyss of Mentality and Self-consciousness. What is human mind in its higher aspect, whence comes it, if it is not a portion of the essence—and, in some rare cases of incarnation, the *very essence*—of higher Being: one from a higher and divine plane? Can man— a god in the animal form—be the product of Material Nature by evolution alone, even as is the animal, which differs from man in external shape, but by no means in the materials of its physical fabric, and is informed by the same, though undeveloped, Monad—seeing that the intellectual potentialities of the two differ as the Sun does from the Glow-worm? And what is it that creates such difference, unless man is an animal *plus* a *living god* within his physical shell? Let us pause and ask ourselves seriously the question, regardless of the vagaries and sophisms of both the materialistic and the psychological modern sciences.

H. P. BLAVATSKY (*The Secret Doctrine* II, p. 81)

THE REIGN OF LAW

[**Ivor B. Hart** is the author of *Matters of Science*, *Mechanical Investigations of Leonardo da Vinci*, *The Great Engineers*, *The Great Physicists*, etc. He is an Honorary Research Assistant and University Extension Lecturer at the University of London.—EDS.]

There are certain terms in modern phraseology that carry with them a significance that strikes deeper into the human understanding than that of mere "importance". Concord and discord, for instance—and still more strikingly, order and chaos. There is an instructive sense of the tragic in the term "chaos"—a disruption on the grand scale—a tragedy of discord—sublime rupture of the forces of concord and order. Unqualified and complete chaos is beyond the human experience; but such faint approximations thereto as violent thunderstorms, and avalanches, and earthquakes can be terrifying enough. One emerges from such shattering experiences to the calm and the peace and the sunshine of a quiet summer's landscape with profound thankfulness of spirit.

In the human personality lies undoubtedly an instinctive craving for concord and order that finds its expression in "Law". H. P. Blavatsky (*The Secret Doctrine* I, 44) expresses it thus:

> This desire for a sentient life shows itself in everything, from an atom to a sun, and is a reflection of the Divine Thought propelled into objective existence, into a law that the Universe should exist.

There is profound consolation in such a thought. It has, indeed, the support of modern science. Even such a terrifying experience as an earthquake is known to be at the behest of law—a definite if abrupt and violent rectifying of the forces of strain to bring harmony and concord back from a temporary and local discordance. So birth, growth, decay, and change are all harnessed into a supreme unity. *The Secret Doctrine*, (I, 145):—

> The Law for the birth, growth, and decay of everything in Kosmos, from the Sun to the glow-worm in the grass, is ONE. It is an everlasting work of perfection with every new appearance, but the Substance-Matter and Forces are all one and the same. But this LAW acts on every planet through minor and varying laws.

Esoteric Science has long taken a stand of sublime simplicity on this subject of Law to which it would appear that modern physical science is itself steadily, if slowly, tending in recent years. The difference of outlook has been that which may simply be expressed by the phrases, "Law," and "laws". Esoteric Science sees, ultimately, one Law; Western Science has been spending centuries in the elucidation or discovery of many laws. There is a vast significance in the difference between these two. Esoteric Science has ever been all-embracing—the sum of Existence and of the

Universe and all "that in it is," all come legitimately within the scope of its enquiry; whereas Western Science has been forced within material limits, so that even the "animate" studies of biology, of physiology, of anatomy and of psychology are approached fundamentally from the materialistic standpoint. We all know that stern, almost puritanical attitude of Western Science that seeks always to eliminate the "personal equation" by a refinement of methods of observation and of recording by the substitution of mechanical and electrical and self-recording devices for the hand and eye and ear of the human experimentalist.

We would ask the reader not to misunderstand our purpose. From the standpoint of Western Science this type of attitude is right and proper and logical. The personal factor is a disturbing influence and must be eliminated. Nevertheless it is inevitable that such an outlook is limited; and if this is so then, inevitably, too, the results must be limited. In Eastern Science the personal, equally with the impersonal, comes within the fold of human enquiry—and so the results are all-embracing. All belong, all are One, and therefore the conclusions are unifying. Western Science, on the other hand, with its self-imposed handicap of limitations, has accomplished a success that is partial only. This law, that law, and the other has successfully emerged from enquiry and experiment. Yet even so the trend of modern science is gradually to indicate that behind these laws is an ultimate fundamental—a central Absolute and Universal Law to which, as a manifestation of its purpose and as the agency for the proper and the ordered functioning of the Universe, these more immediately evident and subsidiary laws are harnessed.

But for the proper comprehension of this there must be no limitations of enquiry. All phenomena, mechanical, organic, mental and otherwise, must be included—and if the enquiry be correspondingly more difficult, then at least the results promise to be more all-embracing. There is, of course, always the difficulty of the application of experimental methods to non-material data, to matters mental and spiritual. But experiment is not everything. There is also the vehicle of *analogy* as a mode of scientific enquiry. "Analogy" is regarded somewhat askance by the student of physical science. But inasmuch as inter-relationships repeat themselves in various forms and degrees in different aspects of the Universe and of the phenomena within it, not only is analogy admissible, but it is certain that, with proper handling, much more can be made of it as a vehicle of enquiry. The part this plays in esoteric science is much more fundamental. Thus we read (*The Secret Doctrine* I, p. 604):—

> From *Gods* to *men*, from Worlds to atoms, from a star to a rush-light, from the Sun to the vital heat of the meanest organic being—the world of Form and Existence is an immense chain, whose

links are all connected. The law of Analogy is the first key to the world-problem, and these links have to be studied co-ordinately in their occult relations to each other.

Still more emphatically, in Vol. I, p. 150 of the same book, we read:—

In Occult Science this law [*i. e.* the Law of Analogy] is the first and most important key to Cosmic physics ; but it has to be studied in its minutest details and, "to be turned seven times," before one comes to understand it. Occult philosophy is the only science that can teach it.

This is a strong claim, and as a mere student of modern science the writer is not prepared to concede it in its entirety; but that analogy, properly understood and accurately applied (and in "Western" Science it is all too true that so far it is neither so understood nor so applied) there is potentially a powerful weapon for further enquiry seems to be also all too true. With its proper aid, that "one absolute, ever acting and never erring law, which proceeds on the same lines from one eternity (or Manvantara) to the other" (*Secret Doctrine*, II, 87), will yet emerge to the understanding and general comprehension of Mankind.

IVOR B. HART

Analogy is the guiding law in Nature, the only true Ariadne's thread that can lead us, through the inextricable paths of her domain, toward her primal and final mysteries. Nature, as a creative potency, is infinite, and no generation of physical scientists can ever boast of having exhausted the list of her ways and methods, however uniform the laws upon which she proceeds. If we can conceive of a ball of Fire-mist becoming gradually—as it rolls through æons of times in the interstellar spaces—a planet, a self-luminous globe, to settle into a *man-bearing* world or Earth, thus having passed from a soft plastic body into a rock-bound globe ; and if we see on it everything evolving from the non-nucleated jelly-speck that becomes the sarcode of the *moneron*, then passes from its *protistic* state into the form of an animal, to grow into a gigantic reptilian monster of the Mesozoic times ; then dwindles again into the (comparatively) dwarfish crocodile, now confined solely to tropical regions, and the universally common lizard—how can man alone escape the general law ?

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Secret Doctrine* II, pp. 153-4

GRACE BEFORE MEAT

[**Lloyd Morris** wrote a trenchant article in THE ARYAN PATH for September 1931, to awaken the East to a sense of Reality, to expose the pride of the West.

In this essay he broods over the kinship of all human beings, so peculiarly strengthned by the present economic civilization—one more appeal for the recognition of human interdependence. The *Bhagavad-Gita* (iii. 12–13) goes deeper in imparting the same instruction :

> "He who enjoyeth what hath been given unto him by the gods, and offereth not a portion unto them, is even as a thief. But those who eat not but what is left of the offerings shall be purified of all their transgressions. Those who dress their meat but for themselves eat the bread of sin, being themselves sin incarnate."
>
> And again, (ix. 27)
>
> "Whatever thou doest, O son of Kunti, whatever thou eatest, whatever thou sacrificest, whatever thou givest, whatever mortification thou performest, commit each unto me—the Self of all creatures."
>
> —EDS.]

Stooped beneath the sky, bowed above the earth ; Man is linked to Man in common bond of jeopardy and toil. By hand and brain he has risen to some lordship over Matter ; and in his triumph become braggart of a little thing. He has developed potencies that are evil, and used them ; he has assembled things that are good, and misused them. He has tamed powers of earth and sky to his hand ; and with human works fenced himself from crude forces unbridled to his mastery. Long domicile within this pale has made him scornful of that beyond his compass ; and forgetful that in the atriums of Science and outside the confines of civilization, the Children of Men are still at elemental grips with the Universal Mother. In the bitter face of Nature's implacable cycles, he hardily denies that her enmity and her eminence yet exist; but broken test tube and elusive formulae are emblem and eloquent to the quiet eye of research ; and they who have their being and task on far reaching paths of wandering, also, look into the visage of Nature, and beneath the dignity of its design, discover the passive hostility of the immutable.

It is in the fashion of Man that he lives by diversities ; and, so, the custom of urban life narrows our understanding with contrary effects. It introduces superior persons who affect a fine insolence of human works, and a marvellous regard for the natural. In the artificial they perceive all that is adverse of human weal ; and adjure us to return, to nature, when all that is ill will be well. At fireside joustings, Bobadil in slippers contemns civilization from his safe security of its enjoyment. He protests that his health, his joyance, and all the

moral fibres of his being droop, from the pampered cossettings of organised society. He arches his chest and declares for the great open spaces and simple, kindly ways of Mother Nature. Beyond the horizon Nature waits on mischance; not to aid, but to destroy. The pure air of a wilderness will not set a broken limb, not tie a ruptured artery; nor bring food to dying lips; but, rather, the preying beast and devouring insect.

From the windowed vehicle of civilization we pleasantly regard the dissolving panorama; and in comely state thrill with vicarious alarms to spectacle of sterility and storm; but not till we have in fact or analytical comprehension passed from the sheltering complexities of our social structure to the elemental, can we rightly know Nature and fairly value gregarian effort.

Of the source of our social comforts and necessities we are indeed incurious; and render but little catechism concerning the quiets and securities which some profess to despise. Wherefrom, and how they come are questions that make no accompaniment to our careless enjoyment and flippant wastage of bounties brought for our provision, on wrung backs and at the weary hands of a multitude of men, women and children painfully abroad this precarious world. Do never the coals in the grate, or the taste on the palate convey anything other than satisfaction or surfeit? . . . no dark, heroic story of their winning? no overtones for our dulled ear of tales recited in the privacy of labouring; hearts in crowded thoroughfare and wild waste?

The story of labour is a story that is epic and puts romance to shame; takes us into the stinking forecastles of leaky tramps lurching heavily over turbulent seas; sends us in the black and roaring nights of low latitudes, up the swaying mast, to clew frozen sails with numbed and torn fingers; consorts us with herdsmen in the chills and heat of remote frontiers; sets us hunger-bitten and thirst-tormented to carry a pack over burning leagues of plain, frozen waste, sterile hill and rock-tumbled valley; besets us on uncertain paths, with devouring perils, and no goodly fellowship for our journeying—only the blistering sun or gripping cold by day, and at night the elusive terrors of darkness, the imminent sky, and visions of sweet cities and thronging life of lamp-lit streets to visit an unquiet sleep; it ushers us into the still, close air of bacteriological laboratories; strangles sleep in the palaces of rulers of men and means; makes us inhabitants of sordid marts, with the whirring factory the tyrant of a grim world; and at last, by humble ways, and dangerous ways, and strange ways of wizardry, brings us to the shelter of our ameliorative households, with tap and switch convenient to our touch; fuel in our cellars, and genially tempered waters ready to run at a movement of our hand; the little shop just round the corner; public vehicles patrolling before our door; and a subservient instrument by which without leaving our warm chamber and easeful couch, we can summon physicians to minister to our bodily ills, and porters to convey foodstuffs to our larder.

Every social benefit we have someone has toiled for. Someone has braved the inclement that we might live clemently; foregone that we may have; died that we might live. Somewhere on desolate seas, in far-off lands, and hither slum, struggle has been waged for the provision we enjoy with such little heed to the providers. Between primitive chance and the meanest citizen in the meanest of cities, are the far-flung units of civilization, wresting from the earth human necessities. In town and city are those who take the spoils of the pioneer, and from them weave, cast and fabricate necessities for all; luxuries for the affluent, and for themselves and for their fellows, each in their degree, comfort or means of a pinched existence hardly purchased with the wage of their hire. And if as we sat at meat, or with satisfied appetite lay securely in our chamber, we would over our feast and before the beating weather lulled us to slumber, briefly meditate our ease, then some melioration might accrue to the armies of industry, and enlarged enjoyment to all.

The social conscience tender under pricking does in its mood declare these toilers no blithe volunteers, but sullen conscripts and complaining mercenaries. If in this we acknowledge a larger truth it is to denounce its greater crime as a product of an ill-regulated, ill-designed, and ill-directed economy that is at once our social detriment and our social shame. Freed-man or serf; conscript or hireling; at least we might fling them a generous word at no cost to ourselves; at least recognise that to promote their well-being is to further our own advantage; at least appreciate that if the social engine, constructively wrong and destructively functioning, has nevertheless produced the relatively complex wonder which is to-day's achievement, how greatly more comely a future waits on the human race, organised and directed in just and scientific co-operation. And should the burden and the beauty of a larger understandiug come upon us, we shall look to issues beyond mere disciplined audits of sociological enhancements.

Man has accomplished little and failed in much: still is he slave to himself, and bondservant beneath the wide sky. His applauded achievements are mute of a greater wastage carelessly, indifferently, ignorantly squandered. For the foundations of our loftiest attainments are digged on dead men's bones unthriftily spent; and puddled with tears of unnecessary misery. Let us then but once in the season of our life, briefly meditate but one story from the epic of Man, for our greater glory and our greater

shame. Let us but once take some occasion to consider how all we use of necessity or spend in superfluity, is won in the first resort by unremitting manual contest with raw nature; then in the drab, ugly factory; and ultimately by the high knowledge which compasses the more delicate and wonderful of our provisions, and is itself dependent for its exercise and advancement, solely on the labour of field workers delving, planting, and contending with black earth. . . . Black earth, bright sun, restless wind and flowing water: to such elements are reducible the magic of science, rare artistry, and the delicate of delicate refinements and common decencies of social life! Up the scale; down the scale; from black earth to black earth: the origin of our daily food, our daily toil, our daily pleasure, our daily toil; the genesis and common end of our material magnificence.

Artist and artizan; scientist and scrubwoman; magnate and scavenger; aristocrat and plebeian: all are subject to the ruths of nature and abide its ultimate stroke. All and each must fairly labour, and fairly give of their bounty. Each to each is necessary, and none in their station more important than another; for none can tell when on them the burden of woe shall fall. And all our commonalty of toilfulness ends in comradeship of rest; but not alone from stricken fields of sanguinary glory is borne the happy warrior. In stifling tenement, sordid warehouse, tilled field, tyrannous kitchen, sleepless nursery, hushed sick-room, unobtrusive study, lowly office, and high seat of authority, sanctified achievement is made and done by joyous workers; whose unlauded heroisms are chronicled only in the untrumpeted tale of the Children of Men linked in happiness and sorrow on this rolling earth.

Therefore as we sit at meat, and before we take our rest, let the master of the house, the ruler of the feast, and everyone to his fellow recite from the tale of Man and say,—Let us now think with gratitude on those members of the great human family whose labours on land and on the sea have provided us with these enjoyments.

LLOYD MORRIS

ORPHEUS, A MAKER OF HISTORY

[**C. R. King** was the Editor of *Torch Bearer*, has published his translation from the original Sanskrit of *The Cloud Messenger* of Kalidasa, and is engaged in writing *Monotheism of Orpheus*.

Orpheus, says the Esoteric Science, is a generic name; hence the difficulty of assigning an exact date; we meet with the same difficulty in fixing any exact date for Zarathustra, for example. We draw attention to the Note which follows the article and which gives the views of the Esoteric Philosophy.—EDS.]

Orpheus, he that

> With his lute made trees
> And the mountain-tops that freeze,
> Bow themselves when he did sing

is not supposed by the average educated person to be anything but a pretty myth, a pleasant figment of the Hellenic imagination. The late Miss Jane Harrison, in her Prolegomena to the study of Greek Religion, held that he was a historical character. The thesis of this essay is that he was no mere historical character, but in very truth a maker of history.

The well-known Orphic religion, which was dealt with in a review of Dr. Macchioro's "From Orpheus to Paul" in the February number of THE ARYAN PATH, was referred by the Greeks themselves to Orpheus as its founder, but because Orpheus was taken to be a myth this attribution has been in modern days generally disregarded. But it should be noticed that the bulk of the ancient references to Orpheus lay stress on his religious functions; and that when details of his magic singing are given, as for instance by Apollonius Rhodius, his theme is how the heavens came to be stretched out like a curtain, how the world began, and the stories of old religion. Antiquity never regarded Orpheus merely as a "sweet singer": like those of the "sweet singer of Israel" his songs were of religious import. It seems uncritical to put aside the whole mass of ancient evidence because of manifest extravagances. It is a total *non sequitur* to say, as modern scholars appear to do, that because stones have never been known to have been moved wholesale by music, and heads have never been known to go singing out to sea, therefore Orpheus never existed.

The case for the historicity, and the historical eminence, of Orpheus does not, however, rest on the mere general principle that where there is smoke there is fire, and that there must have been something in the multitudinous references to the religious work of Orpheus. There is a passage in the "Laws" of Plato (IV. 715D) which, though it has not received the attention it deserves, seems, if carefully considered, to be fairly decisive. Plato in this place speaks of

> God, who, as the old tradition says, holding the beginning and the ending and the middle of all things fares by a straight path encompassing nature.

There is no reason at all to

doubt the statement of the scholiast that the allusion is to one of those Orphic hymns which Plato elsewhere in the same treatise mentions by name. Plato refers to Orphism fairly frequently, and this is not the only place where he speaks of it as "an old tradition". The scholiast cites two hexameter lines of the same purport as Plato's prose quotation, and lines practically the same as the scholiast's are found in Orphic fragments preserved by several writers.

Now the passage in the "Laws" is strong evidence of the existence of monotheism in Greece in an age which was antiquity to Plato. The reader may suggest that the passage smacks of pantheism, and this is readily admitted, for the Greeks drew no distinction between pantheism and monotheism; the Hermetic writers preach pantheism and then break out 'Holy is the Father,' and the same tendency is current in all the Orphic writings. But the point is that the passage is evidence of an ancient Orphic belief in One Immanent God.

Monotheism, or belief in One God even if that God is pantheistic, is not a belief of primitive man. Man at certain stages of development finds gods in stocks or stones or beasts: his religion is animistic or totemistic: he believes in 'spirits of the corn and wild'.

The doctrine of monotheism only comes as an effort of religious genius. The first monotheist known to history, that 'stupor mundi,' Ikhnaton possibly the greatest hereditary monarch whereof the world holds record, who changed, for his own lifetime, a nation's religion almost in the twinkling of an eye, was undoubtedly of that calibre, and so were Moses and Zarathustra, each of them the first 'prophet of God' to his own countrymen. The 'old tradition' of Plato then is evidence of religious genius at the root of the Orphic faith 'in the dark backward and abyss of time'.

What further need have we of witnesses? Antiquity with one voice bears witness that the Orphic religion was due to one great man Orpheus. For those who see, the words of Plato are conclusive evidence of his existence and his greatness. There is no Lazarus who will rise from the dead to assure us that the plays of Shakespeare were written in very truth by Shakespeare of Stratford and by no Bacon or de Vere. There is none who can pledge us that Orpheus was the great man to whom the meteor moment of that ancient revelation came. The case is plain, and they who will not believe would not believe, doubtless, if one rose from the dead.

> As down the night the splendour voyages
> From some long-ruined and night-submerged star,

So, for men of understanding, shines down the ages the light of the long-obscured genius of Orpheus.

We have spoken of the "meteor moment" of that august forgotten revelation: there can be no doubt, surely, that it was in mystical experience that the conviction of the Oneness of God came to Orpheus, as it came, in all human probability, to his great monotheistic predecessors in other countries whom we have mentioned, as well as to the unnamed Hindu genius or geniuses whose experiences underlie the mystical Upanishads. The Orphic cult was essentially mystical, a conscious striving for the union with the Divine; as the renowned gold tablets from Compagno, Petelia, Eleuthernae, and elsewhere in S. Italy bear witness, seeing that it was only in the mystic ecstasy that the worshipper could come to realise himself, in the familiar and magnificent phrase of those tablets, as "a son of Earth and the starry heaven," and to expect for himself the promise,

> O holy and blessed one, thou shalt be a god instead of a mortal.

This striving after the Divine communion was of the essence of the cult and must clearly go back to the founder.

Orpheus in all the ancient accounts is a Thracian, and is connected in greater or less degree with the orgiastic worship of Dionysus which travelled at an early date from Asia to Greece Proper by way of Thrace. Doubtless he was brought up to the frenzied Dionysiac revellings of his native land.* His great soul, united in ecstasy with the wine-god Dionysus, found itself in the grip of a power so strong that he could not but believe it to be the One Supreme Power of the World. Olympus or Pangaens was his Damascus-road, and on the Maenad-haunted mountains he saw the lucent Sabbath of the One.

This is the common form of the mystical experience. In white light ineffable dawns divinity on the soul, which feels that it has travelled beyond the heaven of heavens, beyond all being, in to the presence of Eternal Glory: it is bathed in an apocalyptic sea of bliss, and there is peace as on the morning of Eternity. It is by the unification of consciousness which it effects that this most marvellous of experiences begets belief in One God. In this experience, the soul becomes one with the divine; how, feels the developed soul, can the divine be other than one?

This was surely the experience of Orpheus, who is said, by several of the Christian fathers, from being a rank polytheist to have become a monotheist and a follower of the true way. And this account of his revelation squares very well with the version of his story given by Strabo:

> Orpheus was of the tribe of the Cicones, and was a man of magical power both as regards music and divination. He went about practising orgiastic rites, and later, waxing self-confident, he obtained many followers and great influence. Some accepted

* Otfried Müller shows how much the Orphic Mysteries differed from the *popular* rites of Bacchus, although the *Orphikoi* are known to have followed the worship of Bacchus. The system of the purest morality and of a severe asceticism promulgated in the teachings of Orpheus, and so strictly adhered to by his votaries, are incompatible with the lasciviousness and gross immorality of the popular rites.—*Isis Unveiled* (II, 129)

him willingly; others suspecting that he meditated violence and conspiracy attacked and slew him.

It seems quite likely that, believing himself to have received a revelation, he should have waxed self-confident, and that his bearing as well as the revolutionary nature of his ideas should have aroused opposition leading to his death. Was not the Christ crucified for *his* self-confidence and that in a country less wild than the Thrace of Orpheus?

We have not, in an article of this nature, quoted all the evidence, but trust that enough has been said to show that there is very real ground for believing that Orpheus was a historical prophet who himself made history by being the first to preach to the Greek world that God is One. With the passage in the "Laws" before us, it may almost be said that if we had no other notice of the existence of Orpheus it would have been necessary to invent him: had all the rest of our literary records been consumed by the "vandal mice" and the Caliph Omar that passage would still remain a rock of assurance.

The date of Orpheus cannot of course be fixed with absolute precision, but the following considerations are relevant. The first mention of the name Orpheus is probably that carved on the building at Delphi known as the treasury of the Sicyonians and assigned to the middle of the sixth century B. C.; about the same date he is referred to by the elegiac poet Ibycus as "famous Orpheus". In the popular mind Orpheus was often supposed to be anterior to Homer, but Herodotus is doubtless right in putting him later and in assigning 850 B. C., as the date of the epic poems he is doubtless right as to some part of them. We must allow at least a century for Orpheus to have become famous in Ibycus' time. Orpheus therefore may have lived at any time from 800 to 650 B. C. We shall probably not be far wrong in putting at about 700 B. C. the *floruit* of this great man Orpheus, the Thracian prophet of God.

C. R. KING

Orpheus (*Gr.*) *Lit.*, the "tawny one". Mythology makes him the son of Æager and the muse Calliope. Esoteric tradition identifies him with Arjuna, the son of Indra and disciple of Krishna. He went round the world teaching the nations wisdom and sciences, and establishing mysteries. The very story of his losing his Eurydice and finding her in the underworld or Hades, is another point of resemblance with the story of Arjuna, who goes to Pâtâla (*Hades* or hell, but in reality the *Antipodes* or America) and finds there and marries Ulupi, the daughter of the Nâga king. This is as suggestive as the fact that he was considered *dark* in complexion even by the Greeks, who were never very fair-skinned themselves.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY (*Glossary*)

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

PURPOSE IN PUBLIC POLICY*

[**Professor C. Delisle Burns** is well known for his numerous books on philosophy and economics. Not a mystic by temperament like the author whose book he reviews, he is an idealist whose opinions are always worth a reflection.—EDS.]

Even if I disagreed with the whole of Mr. Middleton Murry's new book, I should advise every one to read it. At least it is an attempt to consider fundamentals in "public affairs": and there are too many other books which are merely exercises in superficial agility. The fundamental issue is the purpose in public policy. Many people in all nations and in all social classes are discontented with things as they are. Some who have wealth or power or security think that they have not enough of such good things. Some feel offended if they see those who speak a different language either claiming or exerting a power they desire for themselves. Some who lack food or security of livelihood more justifiably desire to get food or security at all costs. But behind all these superficial disagreements is a disagreement about the kind of society which men desire to live in. This deeper disagreement as to the purpose of public action, for bringing into existence a desirable society, is not generally discussed.

Mr. Middleton Murry argues that "Communism," in his sense of the word, is a necessary outcome of the policy of the Labour Movement in England; and that such an outcome is desirable. But first, without explaining the difference, he says that Russian Communism is not the Communism he means. He quotes Engels to show that Marx himself did not expect a violent revolution in England: the sentence runs *England is the only country where the inevitable revolution might be effected entirely by peaceful and legal means.* Mr. Murry is concerned to show that the narrower forms of what is called "materialism" are not Marxian: and that "revolution" is, in a sense, "spiritual". It is a change of attitude or point of view, and it demands a disinterestedness on the part of some of those who have something to lose, if the present system is to change. The call to self-abnegation is connected with the teaching of Jesus—the only Christian who has ever existed. And what is opposed is economic individualism—whether the individualism is of one person against another or of one nation against another. The whole work is addressed to those who have inherited or acquired what is best in English

* *The Necessity of Communism.* By J. Middleton Murry. (Jonathan Cape, London. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

civilization. The leaders of the Labour Movement in England are said to have accepted the "patriotic" assumptions of "bourgeois" mentality: and the sort of society which is desirable cannot be attained unless a "revolutionary" attitude is substituted for this.

The second part of Mr. Murry's argument contains several telling points against the policy of the British Labour Leaders in August 1931—both of those who accepted the bourgeois assumptions and of those who were driven to oppose such assumptions blindly because of an instinctive revolt of the rank and file. An English Communism, it is argued, must be a sort of religion: but it will not be what is preached by the Communist Party. Such Communism as Mr. Murry requires is an "ethical passion"—excited by the vision which Marx put before us. It implies an "economics of disinterestedness".

As an enthusiastic exhortation to reject the traditional assumption of British civilization to-day, Mr. Murry's book is valuable. No doubt men will not think of fundamentals, until they feel more deeply. Current economic theories are not based upon an adequate perception of the facts, because their exponents lack emotional vitality. But on the other hand, Mr. Murry nowhere gives a clear statement of what he means by Communism, as contrasted with what Russians mean or what the Communist Party means. He seems to believe that an emotional repentance will project a programme for itself—which may be true; but what likelihood is there that such a programme would be good? Three pages are given at the very end, which are headed "the Practical Programme"; the essence of it is a minimum income, called by Mr. Murry a "wage," for every man, to be established immediately and to be paid out of the proceeds of the taxation of incomes, which are assumed to be already in existence, so that no incomes are left which are above £1,000 a year. Mr. Murry actually speaks of a "balancing of the budget by an increase of direct taxation". He has evidently not studied taxation. "Economics" he says "will adapt themselves to a moral decision:" and if he means that the results of his policy would be full of interest for students of the science of economics—that is true. It would be very interesting to see what would happen. But if he means that the amount of taxable income would remain the same whatever system of taxation was adopted, then he is mistaken. The difficulty of criticising such statements is that the critic may be accused of being a victim of "economic individualism". In any case, it is unfair to put too much emphasis upon the very sketchy financial policy of Mr. Murry's last chapter.

The defect of the whole book is that lack of precision which is most obvious in the last chapter. Many would agree that a community in which poverty and insecurity no longer existed should be the purpose of public policy: and that such a community *might* be established without violence. If that is British Communism, then there are some Communists in the Conservative Party. But the fundamental issue so stated is not sufficiently clear: and it does not become clearer as a result of exhortations to desire its establishment. To believe that it will become clearer by such means is the mistake of traditional Christianity. Unfortunately the hard labour of thinking on details of administration and production is required before we can make any step towards even "the kingdom of God". That hard labour was done by the Russian Communists. Of course, they had enthusiasm as well: and Mr. Murry may be right in supposing that no such enthusiasm exists on "the Left" in England. He deserves thanks for his attempt to make those who accept privileges feel more deeply the incidental effect upon others of the privileges they enjoy. But another possible view is that the failure of "the Left" in England in August 1931 was due to an inability to think clearly. That inability was as obvious among those who accepted the statement of the issue by the financial groups as it was among those who refused to accept the consequences of believing such a statement. Perhaps in a few years we may see more clearly how completely those who derived political benefit from the "crisis" had swallowed an altogether ridiculous, but of course not necessarily dishonest, conception of the nature of the "crisis". In any case, words like "Communism" may be useful on platforms: but government cannot be carried on from platforms.

C. DELISLE BURNS

New Discoveries Relating to the Antiquity of Man. By Sir ARTHUR KEITH. With Frontispiece and Illustrations. (Williams & Norgate, Ltd., London. 21*s.*)

The prehistory of mankind may be compared to one of those pavements with which the wealthy Romans used to adorn their houses. Just as the weather and ploughing of the centuries have broken up most of the mosaic pictures, so that the only evidence left of them is an occasional tessera turned up in a furrowed field; so, on a vastly larger scale, has time obliterated the storied pattern—enormous in extent and intricacy—of humanity's past.

To collect the lost fragments of this mundane mosaic, and with them to reconstruct the original design, is the aim of the archæologist and the anthropologist; but the "tesseræ," for which they are searching, are scattered, not over a few ploughed acres, but about the whole surface of the planet: they take the form, *inter alia*, of implements of stone or metal, potsherds, skeletal remains, earthworks, and erections of stone or brick.

Although an enormous amount of material of this kind has been discovered, especially during the last few decades when it has been systematically looked for, yet it is highly impor-

tant to remember that, in proportion to what we have not, what we have is not much more than a negligible quantity. To attempt to reconstruct the past, prior to, say, B. C. 5,000 with the material at present in hand is rather like trying to divine the pattern of a Roman pavement, of which we have found only a handful of tesseræ. And yet, so apt are we to theorise on inadequate data, that a vast amount of time and ingenuity is being devoted by leading anthropologists to the framing and refuting of one fanciful hypothesis after another. It is perhaps inevitable that this should be the case; and little harm can result if it be generally remembered that, in the circumstances, a hypothesis is but a guess writ large. If our information on a subject be complete, then only one explanation—the correct one—will account for it; but scanty data can be made to fit into the frame-work of any hypothesis that an ingenious mind can construct around them, much as an artist in mosaics could work our supposititious handful of tesseræ into any design he happened to be engaged on.

The real business of anthropological science for some time to come will be the collection, recording and classification of information, while theorising on it should be regarded as merely tentative, and not to be taken too seriously.

In such circumstances it is clear that preconceptions are dangerous; and that the man who sets out with a theory, into the pattern of which he tries to force his facts, is likely to go far astray from the truth. He will be apt to look upon facts, not as clues to the discovery of truth, but rather as confirmations of his own personal point of view. Should a fact turn up that will not square with his beliefs, he will tend to overlook it, or to minimise its implications, or even altogether to discredit it. In a word, he will select, instead of collecting data; and his effects will tend, not to unveil, but to obscure truth.

Complete freedom from bias and a readiness to follow truth wherever she may beckon us, are the rarest of the intellectual virtues. It seems to be almost impossible to avoid *liking* one view of things better than another, and thereby losing that clear and undistorted vision which alone can see through the appearances of things to the underlying verities.

Even so brilliant a scholar as Sir Arthur Keith, whose services to anthropology are very great indeed cannot be wholly acquitted of bias. He is a convinced and enthusiastic Darwinist; and the Darwinist theory is the canon by which he classifies and interprets his material. Both his *Antiquity of Man* and recent supplementary work have nailed to the mast, as it were, the Darwinist flag, in the form of frontispiece diagrams, in which the supposed common descent of men and monkeys is graphically depicted.

Since the original publication of *The Antiquity of Man* in 1915, Sir Arthur has convinced himself that evolutionary changes in the structure of the human body proceed more rapidly than he had formerly believed; and on this ground he now discredits the high antiquity of modern man, and sets aside all discoveries such as those at Galley Hill and Olmo, which he formerly held to prove the existence of *Homo sapiens* (Neanthropus) in Europe in the early pleistocene age. During the last weeks of 1931, however, new discoveries in East Africa have elicited from him an admission that he may be compelled again to change his opinion on this important subject.

Among the topics discussed at length in the present volume is that of the Taungs skull, unearthed in Rhodesia in 1924, and dubbed Australopithecus by its discoverer, Professor Dart, who was satisfied that "the being he had to do with must be given a place in or near the base of the human stem". In Sir Arthur's opinion, on the other hand,

> a careful analysis of all the known features of the Taungs skull and brain has led many anatomists, including myself, to give Australopithecus quite a different place in the evolutionary tree. In all essential features Australopithecus is an anthropoid ape . . . of the same stock as the chimpanzee and gorilla. . . .

The extreme discrepancy in the interpretation of the Taungs discovery by the two professors is reminiscent of the controversy over the even more famous find made at Piltdown in Sussex in 1911, when the fragments of an ancient skull were reconstructed by Sir Arthur Smith-Woodward and Sir Arthur Keith respectively with utterly contradictory results. Pithecanthropus also, the "Java man," has been the subject of endless debate, and his precise status is still undetermined.

It must be remembered that several of the most famous discoveries, hailed by good Darwinists as authentic "missing links," have not been of whole skulls, the shape and characters of which were clear and undisputable, but of small and imperfect fragments, in the reconstruction and interpretation of which, as we have seen, experts have been unable to agree. Slender foundations then for dogmatic pronouncements as to man's ancestry!

In the Piltdown case, as in that of Pithecanthropus, the problem was complicated by the discovery, some little distance from the cranial fragments, of other bones which exhibited characteristics apparently at variance with them. Thus the Piltdown cranium, as reconstructed by Professor Keith, was quite human in character, but the mandible subsequently brought to light in the same locality closely resembled that of a chimpanzee. However, the two bones were eventually accepted by many leading anthropologists as belonging to the same creature; and in this way the Piltdown man, or rather woman, became a "missing link," with a human brain pan, and simian teeth and jaws. The cranium found by Dr. Dubois at Trinil in Java would probably have been attributed to an ape with little or no dispute had not a human thigh bone been found about twenty paces from it. Here, as at Piltdown, the two discordant fragments were forced into an unnatural marriage; and the famous Pithecanthropus was the result. This "missing link" had an ape-like cranium, but walked upright like a man.

The skull, of which some fragments were unearthed by Mr. Turville-Petre in a cave near the Sea of Galilee in 1925, is generally considered to be a variant of the Neanderthal type, and seems to prove the wide distribution of that ancient race of men. In this skull the bone is much thinner than in nearly all other known Neanderthal skulls, while the forehead, instead of being low and retreating, is high and well arched. There is however no way of deciding whether it or they are the earliest in time.

For this reason the datable Neanderthal skull, which was found in the same year in a quarry at Ehringsdorf, near Weimar in Germany, is more significant than the Galilee find. Its decisive importance lies in the fact that it was discovered, not in a cave, but in a clearly stratified, and therefore datable, deposit in the open, which there is abundant evidence to prove is attributable to the genial period that preceded the latest (Wurm) glaciation. Inasmuch as all the known Neanderthal skulls belong to the succeeding cold period—dated by Sir Arthur as extending from 40,000 to 20,000 years ago—the Ehringsdorf relic is much older than any of them, and must be at least 40,000 years old. Instead, however, of exhibiting features even more simian and primitive than the later Neanderthal specimens, the bone of the Ehringsdorf skull is no thicker than that of most modern examples; the cranium moreover is surprisingly lofty: the forehead being even higher and more arched than in the Galilee skull. The cranial capacity of the Ehringsdorf skull is estimated at about 1480 cc. which is about the mean for a modern Englishman. Sir Arthur sums up in the following words:

> As a rule we may regard skulls with thick bony walls and restricted brain space as being primitive in nature, and those with thin walls and expanded brain chambers as highly evolved.*

* It is the opinion of some distinguished anatomists that there is no evidence that the thickness of the skull bears any relation to the mental characters, setting aside pathological cases.—Eds.

When we apply this criterion to the Ehringsdorf skull, we see that it is less primitive than most Neanderthal skulls, and yet it is the oldest representative of the Neanderthal type known to us so far.

Commenting on the fact that the Ehringsdorf skull makes a nearer approach to that of modern man than do the later skulls of its type, Sir Arthur says:

As we trace the ancestry of neanthropic man and of Neanderthal man backwards, we ought to find, if the theory of evolution is true, that there is a growing degree of resemblance between them, for we cannot doubt that both have been evolved from a common stem.

This may be true, but surely if we ascend the stem, we ought, on Sir Arthur's own Darwinist theory, to find *Homo sapiens* and *Homo neanderthalensis*, while approximating to each other, also at the same time approximating to the anthropoid apes which branched off the hypothetical stem at an earlier period. The fact that Neanderthal man appears to get nearer the human norm as we trace him back through time, looks something like disproof of the Darwinist doctrine of man's descent. It suggests, furthermore, that the later Neanderthals were, not an evolving, but a degenerating race, and as such, doomed long ago to disappear as completely from the face of the earth as did the Tasmanians in our own time.

Sir Arthur's remark on the primitiveness of thick skulls with restricted brain space, suggests that such skulls would necessarily be stronger and more durable than those which were thin and lofty. Other things being equal, the cranial relics of a typical "low-brow" would long outlast those of a poet or an anthropologist! If a minority of the members of an ancient community were possessed of thick, receding skulls, may we not infer that, after the passage of tens of millennia, the surviving skulls would be in inverse proportion; that the type that was originally normal would now be exceptional—and *vice versa*? Like many other facts in anthropology, that of the usual thickness of ancient skulls is thus susceptible of more than one interpretation. It may quite well mean no more than that such skulls have the best chance of survival. Bury a Newton in the same grave as the village idiot, and there will come a time when all traces of the philosopher's skull will have disappeared, while the thick-walled cranium of the idiot will have resisted the disintegrating forces, and remained to puzzle the savants of a future age, who might be tempted to build up on the strength of it a theory that the people of eighteenth century England were "primitive" and brutish. The Piltdown fragment, we are told, was so thick that the workmen who found it took it at first for a piece of coconut; but only an extremely thick bone could have withstood the weathering and gravel movements of a quarter of million years. How can such a fragment be taken as typical? It is at least as likely that the lady who owned it was a freak as that all her contemporaries were equally thick headed.

A parallel possibility of error exists in relation to ancient implements. We find iron tools in the most recent deposits, under them tools of bronze or copper, then of polished stone, then finely worked flint and bone, and much earlier still, big heavy flint *coups-de-poing*, or hand axes, which become rougher and cruder as we dig further into the past; and we assume a culture evolving from the battered Kentish eoliths, through many intermediate stages, down to the present elaboration of machinery. It is, however, perhaps more than a coincidence that the degree of durability of human implements follows precisely the same order as their assumed age. A *coup-de-poing* might be subjected to the wear and tear of whole geological epochs, and still retain traces of its human manufacture; while the more delicate tools made, if such were made, by the men who used the eoliths, would have been rotted or ground into dust ages ago. Can the fact then that the only surviving implements of the men of the early pleistocene or late pliocene are heavy, clumsy flints be taken to prove anything more than that, of all the products of their industry, only such almost indestructible flints could in the circumstances have survived recognisable shape?

The story of the recent discovery of the remains of very ancient human beings at Chou Kou Tien in Northern China, as recounted by Sir Arthur, is one of the most thrilling of the many romances of anthropological research.

The excavations at Chou Kou Tien, undertaken by the Geological Society of China, have been proceeding for the last two or three years in charge of a young Chinese archæologist, Mr. W. C. Pei, to whose skill and perspicuity their success appears to be due. Mr. Pei's first finds were a human tooth, a little later came the greater part of the right half of a jaw, then more teeth and pieces of a second jaw. When he received details of these, Sir Arthur concluded:

That in early pleistocene times a strange form of humanity existed in the Far East—already human in size of brain, but showing a strange mixture of characters, both old and new, in jaw and tooth . . . Sinanthropus possessed characters which give him better claims than his contemporaries to be regarded as on, or nearly on, the evolutionary line which leads to modern races of mankind.

With most laudable honesty Sir Arthur has allowed this paragraph to go into his book unaltered, although it no longer expresses his opinion, his motive being, as he says, "that readers may see for themselves how far the methods of anatomists are fallible". What caused his change of view was the finding, in December, 1929, of the now famous "Peking skull," which on the preliminary reports and photographs, Sir Arthur pronounces to be of an exceedingly low type, similar to, though higher than, that of Pithecanthropus, and not to be regarded as in the line of descent of modern man. In 1930, fragments of a second skull came to light with thinner bones and somewhat larger cranial capacity than the first. Until these skulls have been submitted to the closest expert examination, we can only guess at their precise significance.

Up to the time that *New Discoveries Relating to the Antiquity of Man* went to press, no trace of the cultural activities of Sinanthropus had been unearthed; and some men of science, including Sir Arthur Keith, seem to have inclined to the view that he was altogether toolless and fireless, and this, despite the insuperable difficulty of explaining how a creature without fangs and claws of nature's providing or weapons of his own manufacture, could have co-existed for millennia with such ferocious beasts as sabre-toothed tigers, bears, and wolves, whose remains are also found in the cave at Chou Kou Tien. This difficulty has, however, been cleared up by Mr. Pei's latest reports; for the tools and hearths of Sinanthropus have now been discovered, and his essential humanity thereby proved.

Prior to this latest discovery by Mr. Pei, there was no proof of the knowledge of fire making earlier than the Acheulean period in the chronological table adopted provisionally by Sir Arthur, from 40,000 to 80,000 years ago. But Sinanthropus was vastly older than this; and according to Professor Eliot Smith, *his* fires were lit hundreds of thousands, perhaps a million years back from the present time.

Until quite recently it was believed that the invention of pottery was made in the neolithic age, not earlier than about 8,000 B. C., but, as in the case of fire making, current opinions on this point have undergone a revolutionary change as the result of a discovery made by Mr. L. S. B. Leakey in East Africa. In his excavation of Gamble's Cave in Kenya Colony, Mr. Leakey uncovered four distinct layers with signs of human occupation. The top layer contained implements of the neolithic type; under it were two layers with palæolithic hearths and implements of the cultures known as Mousterian and Aurignacian when found in Europe; in the fourth and lowest layer of all, were fragments of pottery, the manufacture of which is thus demonstrated to have been carried on at a vastly earlier period than has hitherto been admitted by orthodox archæologists.

R. A. V. M.

The Fountain. By CHARLES MORGAN. (Macmillan & Co. 7*s.* 6*d.*)
Brave New World. By ALDOUS HUXLEY. (Chatto and Windus. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

I

While contemporary fiction is concerned in the main with the problems and pruriencies of psycho-analysis or the apparently exclusive influence of environment and heredity on individual character, *The Fountain* strikes out boldly into the regions of the spiritual life. Therein its high distinction. It seeks to ascertain the conditions of a life worth living. How, it asks, can the spirit assert its supremacy over the turmoil of existence? To refuse even to put the question, to deny the spirit, to identify it with the appetites of the body and to merge it with the life of groups and institutions is the great modern heresy. Civilisation is breaking down under that error. It has "formed a habit of thinking in groups, classes, masses," but "masses are contrary to nature; they are not born, they do not die, they have no immortality . . . Every final reality of man's life is his alone, incommunicable . . ." It is with these incommunicable realities that *The Fountain* deals. Essentially, therefore, it is a religious novel, for religion, as Professor Whitehead has defined it, is what a man does with his own loneliness.

The ultimate goal of man, Mr. Morgan thinks, is a state of "invulnerability". The great saints and philosophers of history have all, in their several ways, struggled towards this ecstasy of self-knowledge. The desire for it is the only flawless and enduring desire of man. He "will snatch at the promise of even a ghost of that condition . . . He will lose the world for love because in his heart he wishes to lose the world, to shake it off . . . He sees all things moving about him; he sees all consciousness in flux; he desires, if it be but for an instant, to be as the gods are, to be invulnerable, to be still."

The story is of a young Englishman named Alison who finds his search for the invulnerable continually interrupted—and illuminated—by the common incidents of life. He is interned during the war in Holland, near a castle, where he renews the acquaintance of Julie, an Englishwoman he had known in her girlhood. Her husband, von Narwitz, is an officer in the German ranks, and before he returns from the trenches, wounded and broken, the friendship between the two has matured into love, mutually recognised and consummated. But Narwitz feels neither anger nor hatred: his spirit is too strong and refined for that. He sees rather in Alison a kindred spirit, and conceives affection for him and confides to him his innermost thoughts. "Hatred and jealousy and possessive love," he says, in words which reveal at once the nobility of his resignation and the depth of his regard for Alison, "hatred and jealousy and possessive love, perhaps all earthly love, belong to the childhood of the soul, as you know. You are one of the few men living who understand that they are to be outgrown".

The Fountain maintains, that Life is not alien, inimical, to religion; it is not something to shrink from, or apprehend in isolated moments of heightened sensation; it is rather the setting, the field, in which the soul must conquer its peace. If it be objected that the rush and tumble of life must be fatal to any attempt at inward stillness, the answer is that the stillness would not be worth seeking if there already prevailed in the outer world the quietude and hushed immobility of death. "The supreme stillness is achieved in the open. We suffer and enjoy; we fight and love, win and lose; but in the midst of it all, are still." And when Narwitz inquires how the paradox can be made comprehensible, Alison replies, "I can think of a childish parallel with it that everyone will understand. When we play a game, we love to win and hate to lose; we don't stand aside in cold indifference but struggle passionately with every energy of body and mind; yet the struggle is unreal; another and deeper life continues independently of the game, and survives it, and is not affected by it".

A Hindu reader cannot fail to be struck by the resemblance of these ideas to the religious philosophy of India. The "invulnerability" of which Mr. Morgan writes is but the expression, in modern literary idiom, of the ideal of impassibility, of central poise and balance, set forth in the *Bhagavad-Gita*. (II. 14-15)

मात्रास्पर्शास्तु कौंतेय शीतोष्णसुखदुःखदाः ।
आगमापायिनोऽनित्यास्तांस्तितिक्षस्व भारत ॥१४॥
यं हि न व्यथयंत्येते पुरुषं पुरुषर्षभ ।
समदुःखसुखं धीरं सोऽमृतत्वाय कल्पते ॥ १५ ॥

The senses, moving toward their appropriate objects, are producers of heat and cold, pleasure and pain, which come and go and are brief and changeable; these do thou endure, O son of Bharata! For the wise man, whom these disturb not and to whom pain and pleasure are the same, is fitted for immortality.

The immortality which, in these verses, Shri Krishna offers to whoever can regard pain and pleasure, and all the "contacts of matter" with equal detachment, is precisely that inner ecstasy, unaffected by the tide of fortune, which Mr. Morgan considers to be the spiritual ideal. Even the metaphor of a game which he uses to explain the intermingling of the spiritual and the ordinary life, and the relative unreality of the latter, has nothing characteristically English in it, and is well known to all who have been brought up in the Hindu, and particularly the Vaishnava, tradition. The idea of *Krishna-Līlā* expresses just such a relation between the material and the spiritual as Mr. Morgan conceives. And his presentation of the external world as a veil behind which the spirit maintains its incorruptible existence, is it not at bottom the familiar doctrine of *Maya*?

That such ideas should form the substance of the work of an author hailed as being "absolutely of the new time" is surely not without significance.

II

There is one point at which the criticism implicit in *Brave New World* agrees with *The Fountain*—in condemning the subserviency to mass opinions and standards which has become such a prominent feature of Western civilisation. But the truth on which Mr. Huxley lays stress is that man is bound to repugn, in the long run, all the pleasure and comfort in the world if he is denied withal the freedom to face his spiritual destiny squarely. "I don't want comfort. I want God, I want poetry, I want real danger, I want freedom, I want goodness, I want sin," —cries the Savage in *Brave New World*, and the sentence in many respects sums up the whole book.

Yet Mr. Huxley does not see that the revolt against pleasure is itself a phase to be outgrown and without absolute value. Even pain cannot be the halting place of the spirit. The phrase, "the right to be unhappy," would, I think, scarcely occur to the author of *The Fountain*. Its appeal to Mr. Huxley lies in the fact not only that it is clever and paradoxical, but that it expresses perfectly his central conviction of the triviality of what passes for happiness. Disgust of human occupations, especially such as men take delight in, is with him the strongest emotion. It is a kind of disgust he has himself criticised in Swift: only with him it is purely intellectual, whereas in the case of Swift, it was based on a vital and, in comparison, an almost sympathetic comprehension of human error and frailty.

The "brave new world" Mr. Huxley satirises is a pseudo-scientific utopia resting on the twin pillars of Eugenics and Behaviourism. Happiness and Social Solidarity are its watch-words. Its population is bred in laboratories, and are so "conditioned" that when they have performed, robot-like, each his appointed—and congenial—task, he is content to divert himself by fornication or drug himself with *soma*, knowing that in neither case would there be any after-effects to cause remorse. A paradise truly earthly!

And yet one flies from it in horror because its principle is to suffocate the soul under the weight of physical plea-

sure, and to subdue it to a mechanical social routine. Even desire is deprived of its creative force; for it is foreseen from the crade, nay, from the test-tube, and released, restrained and indulged by the external agencies of science and economics. Everything, indeed, is accomplished by external agency: every comfort, every need, every distraction, every longing, is supplied by the elaborately organised institutional system. Nothing costs much in individual exertion. The only, the ubiquitous agent is the Community; it is God, and a kindly God; it keeps the individual in a state of uninterrupted sensual satisfaction—asking from in return no more than that he shall submit to his good fortune, and enjoy himself absorbedly. He may not turn aside, and look within, or beyond, at the stars. To do so is the cardinal sin—to have an inner life, to harbour a private thought, to form a personal attachment. These things generate feeling: they foster individuality: they break the uniformity of the social surface. Hence they are taboo; and taboo also are Art and Religion; and Science even: for all three spring from the same seed: the aspiring, indomitable, tortured and restless spirit of man. To exclude *that* is essential if life is to be an unbroken round of pleasure.

Mr. Huxley paints this nightmare world in violent and corrosive colours. Its hideous materialism fills us with revulsion. But that is all. The satire wastes itself in mockery. That is Mr. Huxley's characteristic weakness: for though he can deride brilliantly and destroy effectively, constructive he is only in art, not in philosophy. His intellect can embrace no fruitful positive conception. That is why *Brave New World* lacks the solidity and sustained fervour of *The Fountain*. Mr. Morgan has raised himself to the height of a spiritual tradition, the tradition which declares that "here, where men sit and hear each other groan," the soul can attain to an immortal bliss; but Mr. Huxley stands alone, perplexed and scornful, able to see nothing in any desire or ideal or instinct of man that is not absurd and contemptible.

K. S. SHELVANKAR

Jewish Mysticism. By Dr. MARTIN BUBER. Translated by LUCY COHEN. (J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., London. 6*s*.)

A Simple Method of Raising the Soul to Contemplation. By FRANCOIS MALAVAL. Translated by LUCY MENZIES. (J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., London. 7*s*. 6*d*.)

Though the possession of anything approaching the nature of a mystical element is commonly denied to the religion of the Jew,—for, the Pauline antithesis of law and faith has stamped it as a religion of legalism,—yet Judaism did give prominence to something more than historicity and tradition or formalism. In fact, in order to save itself from being barren and lifeless, it had to lay stress on the element of personal inward experience. Naturally therefore Jewish mysticism, like other varieties of mysticism, springs from the religious desire of the mystic for an intimate communion with the Deity. And the two outstanding schools of Jewish mystical thought, the Talmudic Midrashic and the Jewish-Hellenistic, cluster around the visionary experiences of the prophets of the Old Testament. But in the Middle Ages, the Zohar became the chief of all the Jewish mystical text-books; and on the subsequent Jewish mysticism its influence was, indeed, inestimable. As a matter of fact, it even inspired Chassidism, the strange form which the powerful Jewish revivalist movement assumed in the eighteenth century in Poland. And it is this Jewish sect, which came into existence as a reaction against the orthodox Judaism of that period, that forms the subject of Dr. Buber's study in the present volume under review.

Being a protestant movement, Chassidism naturally upholds new ideas and novel conceptions from those generally attributed to Judaism. While the founder of the Chassids is Baalshem, the source

of Chassidism is the oral teaching handed down from generation to generation of Jews. Prof. Buber lived among this sect of Jews for some years, and his book, *Jewish Mysticism*, describes their religion, explains their strange beliefs, and narrates their stories and legends in simple style just as the author collected them from the lips of those unlettered people. The distinctive ideas of the sect, such as Deliverance, the Immanence of God, the "return" of the soul, are all clearly put forth, and other interesting tenets are carefully recorded. Though Chassidism appears to us as a movement of the past, the author assures us that its regenerative ideas are still powerful. "In truth," says he, "nowhere has the spiritual power of Judaism made itself felt in the last centuries as among the Chassids. The old power lives in it which once bound the Eternal to earth, so that it might be realized in daily life, and thus, without changing an iota of the old Law, the ritual, or the tradition of daily life, what had become old can live again in a new light and expression." Even to-day the mystical spirit is alive in many a Jewish poet and theologian; but the mystical life is absent because of the unfavourable conditions of modern life to the cultivation of quietude and introspection. Nevertheless, this book will certainly be of as much value to those interested in the adventures of the human spirit in the realm of religion, as to those concerned with this unfamiliar aspect of Judaism.

Wherever man's attention is powerfully focused on religion and the relation of the soul to the Unseen, there mysticism appears under various aspects among all races. The seventeenth century France was distinguished by a sudden outbreak of mysticism as a protest against the representation of the divine and its relation to man and the world in a mechanical or anthropomorphic fashion. Francois Malaval's book, *A Simple Method of Raising the Soul to Contemplation*, gives us an insight into the second phase of that great outburst of mystical religion in France. The keen realization of the metaphysical unity of existence, and, in particular of the intimacy of the relation between the finite and the infinite, is what gives mysticism such element of truth as one finds in it. Driven by the thought of ultimate unity of all existence, and impatient of even a seeming separation from the creative source of things, mysticism succumbs to a form of passive contemplation in which the distinction of individuality disappears, and the finite achieves, as it were, perfect union or identity with the Being of beings.

In his book, Malaval treats of two distinct kinds of contemplation: acquired and infused; natural and supernatural. There are, according to our author, five common obstacles to meditation: illness, depression, lack of preparation, wandering attention and laziness. In the First Treatise of his book, Malaval, like other mystics, teaches a very simple, realistic and supple prayer, maintaining that genuine contemplative prayer, though it begins as a gentle effort of the soul, aided by the grace of God, develops in course of time "a habit of holding one's self in His presence, with more or less facility, according to the condition of advancement of each soul". Our "blind saint of Marseille" does not profess to traverse, within the short space of his book, the vast territory of spiritual experience, or to formulate a practice suited to all souls. In fact, he leaves untouched some vital aspects of the life of prayer and ways of union with Deity.

Though the author asserts,—and that rightly,—that his own path is open in its simplicity to many who have not tried it, yet he, being keenly alive to the requirements of different spirits, sincerely strives to safeguard the legitimate liberty of each. Consequently, his volume is not an exhaustive treatise on the interior life but only a practical guidance to contemplative prayer. His style being surprisingly simple and his presentation strikingly homely, there is some danger of the reader losing sight of the lofty character of Malaval's teaching unless

the book is read with great humility of mind. Further, it must be pointed out that the author, as a Catholic, naturally assumes the normal Christian background of spiritual discipline, and founds his doctrine solidly on the great Catholic tradition of contemplative prayer. These remarks apart, we must say that the efforts to bring out the first English translation of this exceedingly rare treatise on mystical prayer have succeeded not only in contributing a valuable addition to the literature of the interior life but also in making available to modern readers a lost French masterpiece of the seventeenth century spirituality.

JAGADISAN M. KUMARAPPA

Fundamentals of the Esoteric Philosophy. By G. DE PURUCKER, M.A., D. Litt. Edited by A. TREVOR BARKER. (Rider & Co., London.)

This book comprises a series of 48 lectures delivered by Dr. de Purucker in 1924-27. It takes the form of a running commentary on H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine*, a paragraph from which serves as the text for each lecture. The author is a learned and scholarly man, who has clearly devoted much time to studying the classics of Theosophy. Much that he has to say is suggestive and interesting; but, on the other hand, many of his interpretations are very much too speculative. His commentaries on the esoteric teachings sometimes may make them easier to understand, but at least as often render them more complex and less intelligible. Dr. de Purucker as a rule touches but lightly on the more concrete matters dealt with in the *Secret Doctrine*. He has but little to say about the historical, psychological, and astro-physical aspects of Occultism; but delights to expatiate on its most abstract and metaphysical side, in which it is almost impossible for the ordinary reader to assess the value of his utterances. Inasmuch as many of the statements about such transcendental topics in a work like the *Secret Doctrine* are rather to be taken as hints to the intuition than as definitions addressed to the reasoning faculty, no amount of talk, however learned, can possibly make them clear to those whose intuition has not been to some extent awakened. And so it is inevitable that, in his attempts to explain the unexplainable in words, Dr. de Purucker sometimes leaves us with a sense of bewilderment. Where Blavatsky was cryptic, he is merely abstruse.

Dr. de Purucker makes no distinction between the statements of H. P. Blavatsky and his own glosses and comments, but all are woven together into a continuous narrative as *the* Esoteric Philosophy. He is evidently convinced that he is qualified to speak with authority on occult subjects, and we are to understand that, when he supplements the Blavatsky teachings, the original and the added matter are to carry equal weight. This feature of the book must very largely spoil its usefulness for all who do not share the opinion as to the author's occult status which is current in the Theosophical Society of which he is leader.

Very high claims were made for the book in the preliminary announcements, which promised that it would disclose truths known only "to a few elect since the closing of the Mystery-Schools of Ancient Greece" by Justinian. We were told, moreover, that the volume would give out certain "esoteric keys" not contained in the *Secret Doctrine*. One at least of these "keys," namely the importance of the Decad in occultism, seems to have come from H. P. Blavatsky's Esoteric *Instructions*; another is the doctrine of Hierarchies, Dr. de Purucker's statement of which is strikingly divergent from that in the *Secret Doctrine*.

As an illustration of Dr. de Purucker's tendency to seek to extract the inmost meaning of occult teachings by extending them on the same plane—by expanding them horizontally instead of probing them to their depths vertically, we quote the following from p. 217:

> . . . . the 'One', merely calling it the 'One', because it is the Summit or SELF of that Most Great Hierarchy *which our imaginations can attain to*. But beyond its boundaries there are innumerable other such Ones: and beyond all such Ones, there are innumerable hosts of indefinitely greater ONES: and so *ad infinitum* !

Dr. de Purucker gives a clue to his method when he says, on p. 144: "What endless realms for speculation open for us here". He should have remembered the warning words of the great Zen Patriarch, Wei Lang, who said:

> The reason why Cravakas, Pratyeka Buddhas, and Bodhisattvas cannot comprehend the Buddha-knowledge is because they speculate on it. They may combine their efforts to speculate; but the more they speculate, the farther they are away from the truth.

To which the Chinese translator adds the following note:

> Buddha-knowledge is to be realised; it cannot be known by speculation.

R. A. V. M.

The Book of the Gradual Sayings, (Anguttara Nikaya). Vol. 1 (Ones, twos and threes). Translated by F. L. WOODWARD, M.A., with an Introduction by Mrs. RHYS DAVIDS. Published for the Pali Text Society. (The Oxford University Press, London. 10*s.*)

This is a new translation of the first three of the eleven classified groups (Nipatas) of the recorded sayings of the Buddha, which Mrs. Rhys Davids, in an admirable Introduction, describes as "headings for discourse" rather than material to be read in book form. In the first three groups the subject deals with single things, then double things, (such as the "Two ways to Happiness" or the "Two Types of Companion"), then triple things (such as the "Three Occasions on which Energy is to be exerted," or the "Three Forms of Pride that must be destroyed"), and when it is realised that the Buddha's discourses were delivered to a bookless world one can understand the reason for the "arithmetical" method employed.

Some years ago the whole Scripture was translated into German by the Bhikkhu Nyanatiloke, and the first four Nipatas have at different times been translated into English by distinguished scholars in Ceylon, but that is all, and we are therefore as grateful to Mr. Woodward for his undertaking a new and complete translation into English as for the extremely able and intelligent way in which he has begun to carry it out. In her Introduction, Mrs. Rhys Davids praises the translator's choice of renderings of certain Pali words, in particular congratulating Mr. Woodward on leaving the untranslatable term 'Dhamma' in its Pali form. So far we agree, but when she goes on to adopt his rendering of *jnana* as 'musing,' instead of the usual 'trance,' we can agree no longer. If it be argued that there is no better English equivalent we answer that we fail to see the necessity for translating such a term at all. English is not a philosophical language and there is no equivalent to certain Eastern terms. If Nirvana, Kamma, and Deva can be left in the original, why not Jnana and Bhikkhu, for which latter term 'monk' is *not* an English equivalent?

All this, however, is a matter of terminology. Of far more importance is the position of the Scripture in the Pali Canon and its insistence on the dual nature of the self, as shown, for example, in Chapter 4 of the Book of the Threes where the Buddha speaks in terminology which can only be translated, "Self which has dominion over the self," and this duality, as Mrs. Rhys Davids once more emphasises, "the Self with the self, is a music of the old, the original Sakya, which may be said to be almost lost save in the Dhammapada and the Anguttara". Those who have studied her recent works will understand what she means when she exhorts the readers of this translation to listen "with Sakyan not with Buddhist ears," her thesis being that the Buddhism of Ceylon to-day is for the most part Bhikhku-made, and

is at times a sorry parody of the dynamic splendour of the Master's actual words. Herein lies the lesson of this Scripture to those who would confine the Buddha's teaching within the four walls of a dogmatic creed. Not until the wrongful accretion of the centuries is cleared away from the Pali Canon will the vital message of the greatest of the sons of men be known again in the world of Pali Buddhism; for here was no nihilistic pessimism, as the West would fain believe, but the immemorial message of Theosophy couched in Pali terms.

Commenting upon Mr. Woodward's interpretation of certain of the "key words" in the Scripture, this tireless pioneer, who with her late husband has done so much to bring the message of the Enlightened One to Europe, remarks: "It is to these three central words—*Atta*, the man, the self, as both divine and human, *Dhamma* the divine self admonishing, guiding, and *Bhava*, the way of the human self expanding to the divine self—that we need to pay utmost heed in reading these Sayings."

CHRISTMAS HUMPHREYS

Mystery of Life. By PROFESSOR JOHN BUTLER BURKE, M.A, (Elkin Mathews & Marrot, London. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

The Yogi sees Brahman in himself and therefore in the world. But his spiritual experience, according to the Upanishads, is beyond all speech (*Taittiriya* II, 9). This highest spiritual experience is not confined to any particular creed. But, as Professor Burke rightly complains "the majority of scientists have no such experiences and would be inclined to dismiss the testimony of others in this regard either as hallucinations or perhaps sane delusions". "It is difficult to apprehend" says the author further, "why the experience of religious sense should be questioned more than that of the Æsthetic or the Ethical." The ancient Indian thinkers did regard the knowledge and attainment of the Supreme Self—as the science of all sciences or as the only real science (*Muṇḍaka* I, 1).

But as the author says, scientists confine their inquiry to objective truth only. Spiritual experience being subjective does not admit of experimental tests. It cannot be the basis of any truth in the "scientific" sense. There is thus a fundamental severance between science and philosophy.

The limits of scientific inquiry are somewhat extended by recent developments in higher physics and mathematics. 'Even with the aid of the new theories a rational proof of the transcendental ideas is not possible. The author is conscious of this limitation and has taken up the less ambitious but safer way of illustrating and explaining these ideas as highly reasonable probabilities, by the aid of advanced mathematics. His theory of life is based on "an extension of Leibnitz's monadology to the Platonic theory of Ideas on the one hand and to the modern ideas of Relativity on the other". The mathematical explanation of this theory of life is too complex and subtle to be "popularly" explained. Professor Burke has however endeavoured to make the book as little technical as it could be. The treatment of the subject is not merely academic. The earnestness of the author is apparent throughout the book.

Atman, according to Indian Philosophy, is beyond the considerations of time and space (दिक्कालाद्यनवच्छिन्न). By the aid of advanced mathematics the author has shown how the existence of the Monad beyond time and space is conceivable scientifically. "The truth is one, though sages describe it in different ways" says the *Ṛgveda* (I–164–46). The Mathematical philosophy so assiduously developed by Professor Burke can be ranked with these different ways. We join the author in his hope that his method will "smoothen the way towards a reconciliation of the apparent contradictions between mystic or religious and scientific truth".

G. V. K.

CORRESPONDENCE

PRACTICAL INTERNATIONALISM

A profound thinker who at the age of thirty abandons a career to go to minister to the sick negroes of a foreign colony must, alone with his practical work, be pre-occupied with the questions involved in colonisation and the establishments of right relations between men of different races.

Dr. Schweitzer's Hospital is situated in one of the least developed colonies of Africa, whose inhabitants are for the most part among the most primitive still to be found on the Continent. The Doctor is, then, confronted with the very elements of the problem. How does it present itself to him? How does he suggest it should be met?

The independence, he says, of primitive peoples is lost from the moment the first ship touches their shores to barter for native produce—rum or salt, guns and powder or other manufactured articles. The former social, economic and political conditions are from that day in danger, and are overthrown unless governments step in to protect such peoples from the ravages of trade.* Next there arise two questions. Are we simply the masters of these races, justified in regarding them merely as raw materials for our industries? Or are we responsible for the spread of a new social order, for aiding them to a higher development? It is hardly necessary to say that Dr. Schweitzer admits no right to colonize unless the second question is answered by an emphatic affirmative.

The fundamental rights of man which the colonising power must ever strive to preserve are as follows:—

(1) The right to a dwelling.
(2) The right to free choice of residence.
(3) The right to the land and unhindered enjoyment of its produce.
(4) The right to free choice of work and free trade in commodities.
(5) The right to the protection of the law.
(6) The right to live as a natural political group.
(7) The right to education.

Few would dispute these rights in theory, but in practice all are actually menaced by contact with Western civilisation, as Dr. Schweitzer points out in detail. Take, for instance, the right to free choice of work. If there is famine in a certain district, and the men of another, where plenty is enjoyed, refuse to transport food (of course in return for proper payment) to the sufferers, the State must compel them to undertake the work of relief. Again, the employment of porters on the trade routes has throughout African history been a devastating necessity. The State is therefore justified in moving this secular evil by compelling men, in return always for due remuneration, and with every possible precaution, for their well-being, to build roads and railways. These undertakings may for the time being be a far greater evil than porterage, but once they are completed will have the effect of promoting the general prosperity and of saving countless lives.

So far as concerns the securing of legal justice it is noteworthy that Dr. Schweitzer considers the greater cases of injustice such as reach the press may be of less import than the innumerable little cases of oppression and injustice which result from the sending among the villagers of young inexperienced men without sufficient moral weight for posts which require knowledge, tact and broad sympathies. In fact, in every direction it is the individual white man whose influence is decisive. Primitive men, accustomed to patriarchal authority have no understanding for an impersonal "department," and the ultimate success of colonial government rests with the high sense of duty, the understanding humanity, and the idealism of the individuals by whom it is represented.

* What trade with negro tribes meant a hundred years ago is well exemplified in Theodore Caust's *Memoirs of a Slave Trader*.

The sixth right of the primitive man Dr. Schweitzer regards as bound up with the question of the seventh, and as regards education he emphasises strongly the point that it must not only be a training of the brain-power of the native, but of hand and eye and brain simultaneously.* No social order can be built up unless the tribesman is able to construct his own house and grow his own food. The teaching of industries must go hand in hand with the teaching of the three "R"s, or the primitive race will only be transformed into an incoherent society of clerks and the like, economically dependent and unable to evolve a higher civilisation. It is lamentable too that native industries so often go backwards instead of forwards "just when the rise of a solid industrial class would be the first and surest step towards civilisation". To teach the dignity of labour at his Hospital the Doctor often wields a spade or a hammer and gives an example to all, black and white alike, in undertaking with his own hands the humblest and most tedious tasks.

But with the best will to preserve the rights of man, a colonising government is faced in the nature of things with insuperable difficulties.

The tragic element in this question is that the interests of civilisation and of colonisation do not coincide, but are largely antagonistic to each other. The former would be promoted best by the natives being left in their villages and there trained to various industries, to lay out plantations, to grow a little coffee or cocoa for themselves or even for sale, to build themselves houses of timber or brick instead of huts of bamboo, and so to live a steady and worthy life. Colonisation, however, demands that as much of the population as possible shall be made available in every possible way for utilising to the utmost the natural wealth of the country. . . . . For the unsuspected incompatibilities which show themselves here, no individual is responsible ; they arise out of the circumstances themselves, and the lower the level of the natives and the thinner the population, the harder is the problem. In Zululand, for example, agriculture and cattle-rearing are possible, and the natives develop naturally into a peasantry attached to the land and practising home industries, while, at the same time, the population is so thick that the labour requirements of European trade can also be met; there, then, the problems of the condition of the natives and the promotion of civilisation among them are far less difficult than in the colonies where the country is mostly virgin forest and the population is at a really primitive stage of culture. Yet even there too it may come about that the economic progress aimed at by colonisation is secured at the expense of civilisation and the native standard of life.†

To go a step further :—

The Government alone can never discharge the duties of humanitarianism ; from the nature of the case that rests with society and individuals.

It is individuals who must atone for all the blunders and cruelties of the past, regarding what they do, not as benevolence, but as the fulfilment of a duty, the payment of a debt. The simple duties of man to man must be performed without regard for considerations of race, or creed or nation.

It was with these convictions that Dr. Schweitzer, when he determined that for him thinking was not enough, that he must become a doctor and sacrifice his double Professorship at Strasbourg University, his music, and all the richness of his happy, many-sided life, chose for the scene of his activities a remote French colony, because there the need for medical help seemed greater than in the German colonies to which, as an Alsatian, it seemed in 1913 more natural he should go. And since he returned to Lambaréné for the second time in 1924, his Hospital has not only represented a work of atonement for the suffering of alien races, but an internationalism of deed which in the world of the spirit may be not less fraught with significance than the solemn deliberations of Geneva. Among his little band of voluntary workers past and present are representatives of five European nations, while the Hospital is known and helped by people in innumerable lands, even poor Japanese children in Hawaii sending

* As is the practical ideal in the Gold Coast Protectorate.

† See *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest*, pp. 117-118.

their mite to aid their poorer brethren in the African forest.

Dr. Schweitzer's preoccupation with the social condition of primitive races and his practical internationalism are no mere accidents. They rest on his philosophic conviction that all our divisions are a folly, seeing that all life is ONE and the ethical principle he calls Reverence for Life the one thing that matters. He feels that the primitive negro—his brother, but his younger brother as he calls him—in his fundamental attitude to things of the spirit is not so far from civilised man as is generally supposed.

Even though he can neither read nor write, he has ideas on many more subjects than we imagine . . . . The distinctions between white and coloured, educated and uneducated, disappear when one gets talking with the forest-dweller about our relations to each other, to mankind, to the universe and to the infinite.

The broad religious tolerance which characterises Dr. Schweitzer was already with him when in his childhood it first seemed a beautiful thing that Protestants and Catholics should share the church of which his father and the village priest were joint pastors. Later when, both from the standpoint of the philosopher and theologian he studied deeply all the great faiths of the world, it was with no undiscriminating tolerance. He expressly disclaims for Christianity any pre-eminence in rivalry with other faiths that cannot be maintained by thinking and by the intrinsic truth for which it stands, but his conclusion is that it is both the deepest religion and the deepest philosophy.

Borne on the warm current of Divine Love is Albert Schweitzer himself, man of action and mystic, in the world yet not of the world. What he thinks he lives. His books—although three are also "popular,"* and all are straightforward and easy to read—appeal to the most erudite, his acts to the simplest. There is no man in this age of disconsolate wandering in search of a creed to live by whose life and works better repay study. There gleams through his acts, as through his pages, a golden thread of hope for the unity and brotherhood of all who share in the glorious phenomenon called Life.

LILIAN M. RUSSELL

[MRS. RUSSELL was an inspector in the Children's Department of the Home Office of Great Britain from 1917-23, and has worked for Dr. Schweitzer since 1927. She writes about the labour of love bestowed in a very Theosophical spirit by Dr. Schweitzer in an out of the way corner of the world and of which more people should know.

Dr. Schweitzer is an Alsatian and was born in 1895. He studied at the universities of Strasbourg, Berlin and Paris. After taking degrees in Theology, Philosophy and Medicine and resigning two professorial chairs at Strasbourg University and his positions as Assistant Rector of the Church of St. Nicholas' and Warden of the Theological College, he went to Africa in 1913 as a medical missionary and founded a Hospital on the banks of Ogowe, in the Gaboon territory, close to the equator. He is an authority on Bach and on organ-building, and on visits to Europe earns money to continue his Hospital by giving organ recitals and lectures. Among his best known books are *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest, Civilization and Ethics, The Life of J. H. Bach and The Quest of Historical Jesus*.—EDS.]

* *viz.*, "*On the Edge of the Primeval Forest*, which has been reprinted at least seven times in English, and has been translated also into French, Dutch, Swedish and Japanese ; *More From the Primeval Forest*, which appeared in English 1931. (Both published by Black, London, at 6*s*. illustrated) ; and *Memoirs of Childhood and Youth* (Allen & Unwin, London, 3*s*.6*d*.)

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"————————*ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."

HUDIBRAS.

In the *New York Times Magazine* for 27th March, S. J. Woolf publishes his interview with Sven Hedin, the famous explorer, whose opinion about the influence of Europe on Asia is worth recording:

> I have seen the havoc that the white man has wrought. Into a sleepy, contented, happy land he with his egotism has come and said, 'Take on my ways'. And what are those ways? Ways of gain. That is the white man's chief thought. Exploitation for profit. The few improvements and betterments which he has brought with him do not repay the Asiatics for the unhappiness which has followed in his wake. . . .
>
> Atheism is spreading rapidly among its people, and the wonderful old temples are fast decaying and becoming ruins. . .
>
> It is a most common occurrence to see the Lama temples, surrounded on all sides by Chinese farms, used as toolhouses. But though Buddha has gone, Confucius has not taken his place.
>
> When I first went into Asia, the people were contented. Now throughout the land is a new feeling; it is a feeling of unrest and of not knowing exactly what will happen next. It is hard to graft Western thought on an Eastern trunk. The result is not likely to produce a flower.
>
> Think of all that Asia gave before it was touched by the civilization of Europe. Think of the art of the Chinese, who but a short 200 years ago were putting up buildings which for their harmonious beauty rank with the finest architecture in the world. That was an architecture unspoiled by Western ideas. It was a natural product of the soil and climate and adapted to the uses to which it was put. Persia and India, too, have given their share to the world. They gave before the European, with his Occidental notions, came and tried to change the people and make them like himself.

———

The above recalls certain words of a great Teacher written in 1880:

> "As we find the world now whether Christian, Mussulman, or Pagan, justice is disregarded, and honour and mercy are both flung to the winds. In a word, how—since the main objects of the Theosophical Society are misinterpreted by those who are most willing to serve us personally—are we to deal with the rest of mankind? With that curse known as 'the struggle for life,' which is the real and most prolific parent of most woes and sorrows, and all crimes? Why has that struggle become almost the universal Scheme of the universe? We answer: because no religion, with the exception of Buddhism has taught practical contempt for this earthly life; while each of them, always with that one solitary exception has through its hells and damnations inculcated the greatest dread of death. Therefore do we find that struggle for life raging most fiercely in Christian countries, most prevalent in Europe and America. It weakens in the Pagan lands, and is nearly unknown among Buddhist populations. In China during famine, and where the masses are most ignorant of their own or of any religion, it was remarked that those mothers who devoured their children belonged to localities where there were the most Christian missionaries to be found; where there were none and the Bonzes alone had the field the population died with the utmost indifference. Teach the people to see that life on this earth even the happiest, is but a burden and an illusion; that it is our own Karma, the cause producing the effect, that is our own judge —our saviour in future lives— and the great struggle for life will soon lose its intensity. There are no penitentiaries in Buddhist lands, and crime is nearly unknown among the Buddhist Tibetans. The world in general, and Christendom especially, left for 2,000 years to the *regime* of a personal God, as well as to its political and social systems based on that idea, has now proved a failure."

———

In the *Saturday Review of Literature* (New York) Henry Pratt Fairchild, Professor of Sociology at New York University, comments upon the danger of believing blindly in modern science, and its incapacity to assist man in leading the good life. Thus:—

> We live in a scientific age, and science has become a fetish, that is, an object worshipped for qualities which it is believed to possess, but really lacks. We have come to look to science for solution of all problems. But the truth is that science does not, and cannot, offer the solution for any problems of final interest. Science merely furnishes the instrumentalities for the solution of problems. Every problem involves a final objective, and all final objectives are axiomatic. Science can never prove what is good, or beautiful. It can prove what is true and useful only in respect to certain postulated values. The sooner we stop looking to science as the one reliable guide to the good life, the sooner will we be able to set our feet hopefully on the path that leads there.

———

Over forty years ago in her *Secret Doctrine* (II, 663–64) H. P. Blavatsky warned the then scientific researcher:

> For the province of exact, real Science, materialistic though it be, is to carefully avoid anything like guess-work, speculation which *cannot be* verified; in short, all *suppressio veri* and all *suggestio falsi*. The business of the man of exact Science is to observe, each in his chosen department, the phenomena of nature; to record, tabulate, compare and classify the facts, down to the smallest minutiæ which *are presented to the observation of the senses with the help of all the exquisite mechanism that modern invention supplies, not by the aid of metaphysical flights of fancy.* All that he has a legitimate right to do, is to correct by the assistance of physical instruments the defects or illussions of his own coarser vision, auditory powers, and other senses. He has no right to trespass on the grounds of metaphysics and psychology. His duty is to verify and

to rectify all the facts that *fall under his direct* observation; to profit by the experiences and mistakes of the Past in endeavouring to trace the working of a certain concatenation of cause and effects, which, but only by its constant and unvarying repetition, may be called A LAW. This it is which a man of science is expected to do, if he would become a teacher of men and remain true to his original programme of natural or physical sciences. Any sideway path from this royal road becomes *speculation*.

Instead of keeping to this, what does many a so-called man of science do in these days? He rushes into the domains of pure metaphysics, while deriding it. He delights in rash conclusions and calls it "a *deductive* law from the *inductive* law" of a theory based upon and drawn out of the depths of his own consciousness: that consciousness being perverted by, and honeycombed with, one-sided materialism. He attempts to explain the "origin" of things, which are yet embosomed only in his own conceptions. He attacks spiritual beliefs and religious traditions millenniums old, and denounces everything, save his own hobbies, as superstition. He suggests theories of the Universe, a Cosmogony developed by blind, mechanical forces of nature alone, far more *miraculous and impossible* than even one based upon the assumption of *fiat lux* out of *nihil*—and tries to astonish the world by such a wild theory; which, being known to emanate from a scientific brain, is taken on *blind faith* as very scientific and the outcome of SCIENCE.

During the last month Bombay has witnessed the degrading spectacle of communal riots when men showed what power the beast in human nature possesses. Below we quote a pertinent paragraph from the stenographic report of a lecture delivered in July 1930, at the Bombay United Lodge of Theosophists:—

> "What shall India do? India must turn from religions to Religion; India must destroy superstition and ignorance and find spiritual Knowledge; must leave aside blind belief and beget illumined faith. Let us invoke and evoke, call to action the Will, the Spiritual and Golden Will that alone will enable us to do away with our own superstitions and strike the blow at our ignorance. If every Hindu brother were to live and practise the Truth of the Vedas that every man and woman is an aspect of the great Purusha; if every Moslem were to recognize the fact of his own religion that every man and woman lives by the Nur of Allah; if every Parsi were to recognize that it is far more spiritual and noble and better to be an *Indian* than to be only a Parsi, and that as a true Zoroastrian he must first fight Ahriman within himself and within his own community; if every Sikh were to follow the wise precepts of Guru Nanak and his predecessor, Kabir; if every Indian Christian were to realize that the light of Christos is that light which lighteth every child that cometh into the world; Ah! then, and then only, would we really raise ourselves and help to élevate the world."

ॐ

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light ! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. III — JULY 1932 — No. 7

THE NEED OF OUR WORLD

> Spirituality is on its ascending arc, and the animal or physical impedes it from steadily progressing on the path of its evolution only when the selfishness of the *personality* has so strongly infected the real *inner* man with its lethal *virus*, that the upward attraction has lost all its power on the thinking reasonable man. In sober truth, vice and wickedness are an *abnormal*, *unnatural* manifestation, at this period of our human evolution—at least they ought to be so. The fact that mankind was never more selfish and vicious than it is now, civilized nations having succeeded in making of the first an ethical characteristic, of the second an art, is an additional proof of the exceptional nature of the phenomenon.
>
> H. P. BLAVATSKY (*The Secret Doctrine* II. 110)

In these days of penury and woe people wish to simplify life, implying that they must disentangle themselves from the want of things. Not given to philosophic reflection they do not analyse the character of their wish : they conclude that some thing must be done to those many things which they want, instead of perceiving that it is their want which needs attention, treatment, modification.

The old sages of India divided the whole round of human evolution into two–*pravritti* and *nivritti margas*, the paths of involution and evolution. The soul involves itself in nature, matter, *prakriti*, acquiring and adding to its storehouse of possession numerous objects, with a view to use them as vehicles through which experiences are procured. Then ensues the second half of the pilgrimage : experiences gained through vehicles having become part and parcel of the soul, it begins to throw out all and sundry vehicles retaining only its

own sphere of memory—the One Vehicle. Memory is called the mother-faculty. In the process of acquisition the soul becomes dependent on these many vehicles, even when they have become unnecessary. Through acquired habit man clings to his possessions of the past; at the same time, because of his own development, through the cycles, he keeps on discarding those possessions to free himself. This dual process causes the perplexing period of transition.

This phenomenon in the large cycle of evolution of the human kingdom repeats itself in the small cycle of the pilgrimage of each soul, and again in the still smaller cycle of every incarnation. In the early part of his life man labours to collect wealth of every kind; in the second half he struggles to dispose of what is gathered.

To conform himself to the processes of nature a wise man follows the injunction of the ancient Law Givers, and wilfully and willingly he parts company with the things of the world when "he sees his grand child playing at his knees". He learns to be dependent on only one vehicle, in this instance, his own body, in which are now stored all the experiences of his life. Not wealth, but the power to make wealth is his. With that one vehicle he retires, (he is named *vanaprastha*, forest-dweller), to emerge a little later to serve his fellows (and then he is named *sannyasi*).

In the olden days men practised, life after life, this willing and conscious giving up of possessions. Now it is considered fashionable and even righteous to die in harness, *i.e.*, in the condition of entanglement in worldly affairs. Men have lost the habit of giving up, and the very faculty is atrophied. This giving up is not merely donating out of one's super-abundance; it is the result of superb self-reliance—man is no more dependent upon things and beings, but lives in himself and exerts for others with his spiritual resources. Such was the rule of the old world; it should become the ideal for the modern world.

Nature is methodical and slow in its processes and none of our faculties unfold suddenly as by a miracle. We cannot suddenly become self-dependent, and live without the aid of a hundred things, when through centuries we have learnt to be dependent upon millions of them. Men and women of our civilization have made their own lives more woeful. They have defied Nature for several centuries and have precipitated among themselves the abnormal and unnatural manifestation referred to in the text with which this article opens. Nature is not revengeful; and our present world-depression is but Nature's attempt to re-adjust her disturbed harmony. We will not aid her by persisting in our old ways; therefore, President Hoover's plan—buy a new motor-car and prosperity will drive in—will not work. Nor will the other extreme

prove fruitful—to abstain from things wanted, when the craving for them persists, and is even dwelt upon. Disband your factories, destroy your machines, and be contented in loin cloth, and with a spinning wheel—that will not work either; for, masses of mankind are not ready, have not arrived at that turn of the spiral of evolution when they can live thus. Even modern India is not experienced enough to do this. To force a man to give up things when his desires are not extinct but only slumbering is unwise; very soon the devil in him will let itself loose. In the case of a nation such an imposition will result in lawlessness and chaos.

The philosophy of giving up must be promulgated as one worthy of immediate study. Mass-mind has to be prepared, and individuals must put into motion some Divine Ideas which purify and elevate. But such promulgators have their own lower natures to contend against, their own wants to control and their own desires to discipline. They also cannot afford to do violence to their natures by extreme measures. Their lives must flow evenly, if they are to effect that change in the mass-mind. They must learn so that they may teach.

What?

To begin with there are three Divine Ideas which should be studied and dwelt upon, so that they may move the minds of an increasing number of men and women. W. Q. Judge, who served humanity by promulgating Divine Ideas, presented them (*The Irish Theosophist*, February 1895) thus:—

> Among many ideas brought forward through the theosophical movement there are three which should never be lost sight of. Not speech, but thought, really rules the world; so, if these three ideas are good let them be rescued again and again from oblivion.
>
> *The first idea* is, that there is a great Cause—in the sense of an enterprise—called the Cause of Sublime Perfection and Human Brotherhood. This rests upon the essential unity of the whole human family, and is a possibility because sublimity in perfectness and actual realization of brotherhood on every plane of being are one and the same thing. All efforts by Rosicrucian, Mystic, Mason and Initiate are efforts toward the convocation in the hearts and minds of men of the Order of Sublime Perfection.
>
> *The second idea* is, that man is a being who may be raised up to perfection, to the stature of the Godhead, because he himself is God incarnate. This noble doctrine was in the mind of Jesus, no doubt when he said that we must be perfect even as is the father in heaven. This is the idea of human perfectibility. It will destroy the awful theory of inherent original sin which has held and ground down the western Christian nations for centuries.
>
> *The third idea* is the illustration, the proof, the high result of the others. It is, that the Masters—those who have reached up to what perfection this period of evolution and this solar system will allow—are living, veritable facts, and not abstractions cold and distant. They are, as our old H. P. B. so often said, *living men*. And she said, too, that a shadow of woe would come to those who should say they were not living facts, who should assert that "The Masters descend not to this plane of ours". The Masters as living facts and high ideals will fill the soul with hope, will themselves help all who wish to raise the human race.

WHAT DOES DEATH MEAN TO YOU?

I.—THE ABSTRACT IDEA

[**Max Plowman** is known for his works on Blake; he is a man of mystical insight; he follows the advice of the *Bhagavad-Gita* and meditates on Death and records the result of that meditation in an essay, in three instalments. "What does death mean to me?" "A change in the mode of living. It means freedom from the limitation of sense perceptions in the exercise of pure imaginative consciousness." In this first part Mr. Plowman examines the attitude of mind engendered by science, proud and positive but capable only of making a weak and negative response.—EDS.]

The title calls for apology, for the question is personal, indeed it is almost impertinent. My apology is this. I want, if possible, to avoid the generalisations which current intellectual sophistry is ready to offer in place of conviction. What people think about death is usually not very interesting because so often it is nothing but a *réchauffé* of opinions, and therefore, properly speaking, not thought at all; on the other hand, what they feel in the presence of death is more than interesting, it is deeply moving. I want if I can to find out what people feel about death. I want to present as simply as possible my own convictions. I want to get below the rationalism, indifference and cynicism which, over large portions of the globe, at present obscure the truth.

The question invites a tremendous effort of self-examination. For my part, I know that unless I can give a true record of my own experience and make a simple interrogation of my own consciousness, I shall have nothing profitable to say. And the temptation to abstraction is fierce. Yet ultimately, what does it matter to you or to me what a million men have thought about death? Each of us has to die his own death. The only wisdom of final value to us is that which we have learnt by experience, or has been so absorbed by consciousness as to have become our own. In the face of death, all dogma, all precept is but the echo of a distant sound. To discover what death means, it is our own hearts we have to search, our own experience we must plumb, the evidences of our own senses that is required.

What does death mean to me? As a matter of *fact*, it means simply nothing. If I am to rely upon the evidence of my senses, they report that death means individual nothingness. I have reason to believe that a shell once dropped on the parapet of a trench in France and that its explosion threw me across the trench. I say I have reason to believe this but my evidence of the fact would not be accepted in a court of law, for it is merely what I was told when I awoke four hours later gazing at the sky.

Of the event itself, and of those four hours, I was, and am, as unconscious as a child unborn. So far as the record of consciousness is concerned, I was dead, and that death was a blank, a gap in existence without dream or impression of any kind. And the experience of seeming obliteration has been repeated under the influence of an anæsthetic. My senses report that death is a nothingness.

A moment's consideration will show that they could not well report anything else. Any sense destroyed reports a nothingness where before there was sensation; we do need experience to teach us that animate life is dependent upon sensation. But—and here we enter upon the fringe of the whole vast problem—I know that my life, here and now, is not purely a matter of sensation. Consciousness, though it acts by means of the organs of sensation, is greater than they and is in large measure their governor and director; and the creative imagination, which is the activity of consciousness, is positively independent of sensation. So it appears that, here and now, I am in possession of greater faculties than can be bounded by sensation. What is the meaning of these? If they have being, then they have importance. If they have life that is not bounded by the senses, then I am more than a sense-organ, and if I am more than a sense-organ then it is useless to appeal to the senses for the last word concerning death.

Let us attempt to be even simpler. Why do we embrace life and shun death? Because life is pleasant and death painful in its action. Man wants to be happy, and so long as life holds the prospect of happiness he clings to it. He will cling to it even after the conscious prospect of happiness has gone, for the unconscious instincts have formed the habit of pursuing happiness and will continue the pursuit long after the conscious mind has abandoned hope: the suicide has to murder his instincts before destroying himself.

And what is the simplest and most elementary form of happiness? Surely the gratification of the senses, to be observed in the child at its mother's breast. Here is happiness at its human source—the appeasement of hunger. That is what all life is, the appeasement of hunger. The whole of human life is just the sublimation of this simple desire for enjoyment, the lifting of this passion for self-gratification from elementary to higher and higher levels of experience until metamorphosis takes place and the love that "seeketh only self to please, to bind another to its delight" becomes the love that

> seeketh not itself to please
> Nor for itself hath any care,
> But for another gives its ease
> And builds a Heaven in Hell's despair.

Life is only desirable to us while we want to exercise, in one form or another, the hunger of love. For love is life, and there is no life apart from love.

It would be unnecessary to state

such platitudes were it not for the fact that abstract ideas have become the bane of modern thought. Death is abstracted from life and regarded as pure phenomenon: it becomes an intellectual idea, and people capable of holding the idea deceive themselves into thinking they have faced death. They have, on the contrary, merely thrust reality from their minds in order to contemplate their own substitutes for it. The sovereign way to destroy the real idea of death is to abstract all thought of love from life, and then to regard death as a fact unrelated to feeling. For apart from love, death is quite meaningless. But so is life. Why then should we persuade ourselves that it is honest to regard death dispassionately? Louder than any other, death challenges love. Do we answer that challenge by pretending that love is not involved?

During the last half-century the effort to abstract the idea of death and treat it from the standpoint of science has become implicit in most of our western literature. Just because death has not objective existence this pseudo-scientific effort is, of course, entirely vain. Strictly speaking, science does not know of death, but only of change, for science uses the word death only to connote a natural process, common to every form of life—a part of the cycle of life to be observed in all nature. Seed, shoot, bud, flower, fruit, seed, is the complete cycle: why regard any one of these changes as climacteric?

Apart from human consciousness there is no reason why death should not be regarded simply as a fact; and science, being concerned with facts, and having nothing to do with the effects of human consciousness upon fact—science, in short, being objective, or not science—is right to regard death merely as a fact. The matter for wonder is that human beings, in their craving for factual certainty, should have failed to see that the most momentous issues of their lives must remain for ever outside the reach of science—the strange thing is that man, with all the creations of his own imagination surrounding him, should fail to observe that what gave birth to each one of these is an activity of life beyond the reach of science. This only serves to show how bewitched by the dicta of science western man has become: in a scientific era he can only receive instruction from science. With the foundering of his religious faith, crazily overweighted with dogma and bearing charts of a mythological world, he found himself in such a sea of despair he clutched at every straw of fact floating above the flood, and forgot, that the use of his own limbs might prove his saving. We are still moving on the tide of reaction to the acceptance of religious dogma for truth, and part of this reaction takes the very reasonable form of disbelief in any kind of authoritative statement about death, other than that which science pronounces. For my part I would not change that movement if I could: I would only accelerate it by restoring belief in the validity of faith. Agnosticism is the natural and honest attitude to dogma that stands by its historic truth and has proved to be historically untrue. Agnosticism is an admirable attitude, provided it is maintained in humility; for it places the burden of conviction upon faith (which is the only ground of religious conviction) and thus prevents pseudo-religious credulity from attempting to palm off the evidence of reason as valid for faith. But agnosticism is a negative and becomes detestable when it grows proud and wants to claim for itself the attributes that belong only to a positive. Yet this is what it has done recently, and the assumption usually goes unchallenged. Rationalism has arrogated to itself the status of religious belief and made its own inherent limitation the bound of truth.

MAX PLOWMAN

Science regards man as an aggregation of atoms temporarily united by a mysterious force called the life-principle. To the materialist, the only difference between a living and a dead body is, that in the one case, that force is active, in the other latent. When it is extinct or entirely latent the molecules obey a superior attraction, which draws them asunder and scatters them through space.

This dispersion must be death, if it is possible to conceive such a thing as death, where the very molecules of the dead body manifest an intense vital energy. If death is but the stoppage of a digesting, locomotive, and thought-grinding machine, how can death be actual and not relative, before that machine is thoroughly broken up and its particles dispersed? So long as any of them cling together, the centripetal vital force may overmatch the dispersive centrifugal action. Says Eliphas Levi: "Change attests movement, and movement only reveals life. The corpse would not decompose if it were dead; all the molecules which compose it are living and struggle to separate. And would you think that the spirit frees itself first of all to exist no more? That thought and love can die when the grossest forms of matter do not die? If the change should be called death, we die and are born again every day, for every day our forms undergo change."

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Isis Unveiled*, I, p. 480

THE DOCTRINE OF NON-VIOLENCE

A STUDY IN THE GITA

[**G. V. Ketkar**, B. A., LL. B. is one of the two founders of the *Gita* Dharma Mandala, the other being the blind Karma-Yogi, Bhide Shastri, about whom an article appeared in our last number.

Mr. Ketkar argues his case cogently, and there is force in much that he has said; we, however, do not wholly agree with all his contentions and deductions.

We are among those who have the weakness to believe that not only the *Gita* but the whole of the *Mahabharata* has an allegorical background. In the ancient world history and myth were two devices simultaneously used—one to describe events, the other to illustrate moral and spiritual verities locked up in them. If Mr. Ketkar finds serious difficulties in assigning parts to characters and in interpreting events, if the Epic is to be read as an allegory, he will find that task equally arduous, if not more so, when he insists that the *Mahabharata* must be taken as a piece of pure history.

Further, we draw our readers' attention to a Note appended to this very interesting article, the subject of which should be further discussed.—EDS.]

"He who is free from the sense of egoism and whose Motive is untaintable, even if he kills all people he does not kill nor is he bound."

—*Bhagavad-Gita* xviii, 17.

This is a free translation of the verse which is a riddle to many; among them particularly to Mahatma Gandhi who is the outstanding exponent of the modern school of absolute *Ahimsa*. Their difficulties are rooted in the very setting of the *Gita*—a battle-field, blowing of conches, flying of arrows and Krishna's repeated injunctions to Arjuna to fight the battle. For them, as Sitānāth Tatwabhushan says in his *Krishna and the Gita*, it is an "awkward setting".

It had already made some of the old commentators uneasy, for they wanted to show that the *Gita* propounded spiritual inaction. In the first place, they said, that action is possible or advisable only for those who are imperfect in knowledge, and Krishna's call to action was due to imperfection in Arjuna. But then how explain people like Janaka, who were perfect in knowledge, and attained salvation through action; further Krishna himself does incessant work (*Gita* iii, 23). These passages are either set aside as *obiter dicta* (*artha-vāda*) or the action referred to is regarded as technically inaction and non-work. Secondly they argue: Arjuna was on the battle-field for the purpose of fighting; want of true knowledge was the difficulty, and that was supplied by Krishna. Arguing in this round-about way they conclude that Krishna aimed not to induce Arjuna to fight but to remove his ignorance. This looks like making a world of difference between six and half-a-dozen. But this tortuous argument has prevailed among generations of Shāstris.

A shastraic injunction (विधिः) must be for something which is not already in existence. But Arjuna's preparedness for battle was already in existence. Therefore the Shastris conclude that the words like युध्यस्व (fight) do not form technically an injunction. They must be construed as something tolerated, condoned, or assumed (अनुवादः)

There are other devices. It is needless to enter into them. The above are typical and are given in order to compare them with the methods used by modern advocates of absolute *Ahimsa*. Their problem is harder than that of the old Shastris, but their ingenuity is greater. With one stroke they set aside the setting of the *Gita*: It is an allegory. The battle was not a real battle, just as the traveller in *Pilgrim's Progress* was not a real traveller but a Christian's soul striving for salvation.

They think it unnecessary to explain the allegory with reference to the whole Mahabharata. If the war in the *Gita* is allegorical the whole of Mahabharata must be shown to be an allegorical description of the conflict in human mind. This is impossible to demonstrate. Nor do they explain the allegory even with regard to the whole of the *Gita*. If "Kurukshetra" is the human mind, what places are to be given, for example, to *Bhishma* and *Drona*? If all the Kouravas are to be taken as passions and evil tendencies, how is it that they are mentioned nowhere except in the first chapter?

The advocates of absolute *Ahimsa* realise the difficulty, as is evident from their explanations of other references to "fighting". If fighting and killing imply overcoming inner passions why argue that Arjuna was asked to fight only because he was a *Kshatriya* or warrior by caste? The overcoming of passions is necessary, surely, for *all* minds.

But all these devices notwithstanding, the general statement in the seventeenth verse of the eighteenth chapter stares us in the face. It is expressly stated that the action of a man, who has attained a certain mental development, and whose motive is pure and noble, though it outwardly looks like murder is not really murder; no responsibility for killing really attaches to that man. But Gandhiji, in his recent translation of the *Gita* (अनासक्ति योग) has found a curious way of getting round this passage. He says that it is impossible for a man to be absolutely free from egotism and to have absolutely a pure motive (बुद्धिः); therefore this verse must refer to God; as man never reaches this ideal, this verse is not to be applied to human beings at any stage. But the context opposes this view. There are five elements present in all human actions good or bad, and these produce actual accomplishment (xviii, 13–15). These actions are done by man—the specific word for man (नरः) being used in the fifteenth verse. In these circumstances, a man with egotism,

who regards that he himself alone is the doer, is ignorant. (xviii, 16). Immediately follows the verse in question. After dealing with the ignorant man in the preceding sixteenth verse, this seventeenth deals with the action of a man of true knowledge. The subject of *human* action is continued and in the following verse are enumerated the inward and outward constituents of *human* action. Mahatma Gandhi's explanation of the seventeenth verse, therefore, does not fit the context.

Gandhi's difficulty in this passage arises from the insistence even on *outward* non-killing or non-violence. Those who believed in absolute outward renunciation met with similar difficulties in the past. They stressed Arjuna's lower stage of spiritual development in order to justify their own interpretation that absolute outward renunciation must precede true knowledge (सर्वकर्मसंन्यासपूर्वकम् ज्ञानं). Gandhiji proceeds to argue from the other end and regards the ideal as beyond the reach of humanity—like the straight line in geometry which is unobtainable in practice.

These tortuous ways of getting round the clear statement in the *Gita* are all the more regrettable, because they are so unnecessary. They are pressed into service as a device to conform the *Gita* to the dogmatism of superficial and external *Ahimsa*. Similar ways of interpretation were in old times used to bring the *Gita* in conformity with the absolute external renunciation. But both *Sanyasa* and *Ahimsa*—Renunciation and Non-violence in the *Gita* are essentially inner processes. Action has to be judged by the inner motive and not by its outer results. The action itself is far less important as compared with the purity of motive which is made steady and unperturbable by Yoga. The key to the mystery of action and duty is supplied in the following:—

कर्मण्येवाधिकारस्ते मा फलेषु कदाचन ।
मा कर्मफलहेतुर्भूर्मा ते संगोऽस्त्वकर्मणि ॥
योगस्थः कुरु कर्माणि संगं त्यक्त्वा धनंजय ।
सिद्धयसिद्धयोः समो भूत्वा समत्वं योग उच्यते ॥
दूरेण ह्यवरं कर्म बुद्धियोगाद्धनञ्जय ।
बुद्धौ शरणमन्विच्छ कृपणाः फलहेतवः ॥
—गीता, अध्याय २; ४७,४८,४९

Let, then, the motive for action be in the action itself, and not in the event. Do not be incited to actions by the hope of their reward, nor let thy life be spent in inaction.

Firmly persisting in Yoga, perform thy duty, O Dhananjaya, and laying aside all desire for any benefit to thyself from action, make the event equal to thee, whether it be success or failure. Equal-mindedness is called Yoga.

Yet the performance of works is by far inferior to mental devotion, O despiser of wealth. Seek an asylum, then, in this mental devotion, which is knowledge; for the miserable and unhappy are those whose impulse to action is found in its reward.

—*Bhavagad-Gita* II; 47, 48, 49

The *Gita* includes *Ahimsa* in its enumeration of virtues belonging to the state of perfect spiritual knowledge (xiii, 7). *Ahimsa* has also a prominent place in the list of godly qualities (xvi, 2). Thoughtless and ignorant action, with regard to its violent and destructive consequences, is condemned as belonging to the quality of darkness (xviii, 25). But with all this Arjuna is repeatedly asked to fight. How is this contradiction to be explained? Killing as an outer action must be distinguished from the inner motive behind it. Human law regards man as responsible for the consequences of his act. Natural law takes also into account the purity or impurity of his motive. The enigmatic sentence "killing kills not" may be expanded as follows:—"killing to all outward appearances; but inwardly incapable of evil because absolutely pure in motive and completely selfless."

The rule that man is responsible for consequences of his actions holds good generally; but it fails in the ultimate analysis. Circumstances outside human control come in the way and influence the outward results of action. If the action is pure in motive, completely selfless, prompted only by the desire to do good to all beings, the external form and the outward result of his actions are really immaterial. The man of pure motive is not affected by the results of his acts.

Mahatma Gandhi himself by his non-violent method of resistance provides an excellent illustration of the proposition laid down in the seventeenth verse of the eighteenth chapter. A non-violent civil resister invites violence on himself and his followers, and at times on the general public. The natural and probable consequences of civil resistance is violence—violence done by the other side but provoked by the non-violent resister himself. All this one-sided *Himsa* will be destroyed if the civil resister would refrain from resisting evil non-violently! But he has to choose this lesser violence in order to combat a greater violence. In his usual way Gandhi would say that the civil resister is responsible for all the one-sided unavoidable violence that results. The *Gita* on the other hand will say that if the non-violent resister is completely selfless and pure in motive, the responsibility of all this violence does not lie with him. Though in a very external sense he seems to be responsible for it, in reality he is not responsible. With regard to him it can be said that "He kills not, nor is he bound".

The point at issue, let it be noted, is not between violence and non-violence, as it is often misrepresented. It is between the external, outward and superficial non-violence and the real inward and ultimate *Ahimsa*. Real *Ahimsa* is rooted in the selfless and pure motive and the desire to be good to all (सर्वभूतहिते रतिः). Acting with this motive, men who guide the destinies of humanity in an imperfect and perplexed state of society are often faced with two evils. Indeed this is not a very common situation but neither is it so rare as Gandhi would suppose. Arjuna was faced with such a situation. The fourfold division of duties (चातुर्वर्ण्यं) was the mainstay of the social

structure as it then existed. Arjuna had to fight for the right cause lest the whole structure would collapse. This was a greater anarchy (संकरः) than that which would follow from the loss of life, to which Arjuna referred in the first chapter. This greater anarchy Krishna describes in the twenty-fourth verse of the third chapter.

The real definition of non-violence (अहिंसा) is given by Dnyaneshwara in his Marathi commentary on the *Bhagavad-Gita* viz., "In thoughts, words and deeds one should be guided by the sole motive of doing good to all —this is the essence of *Ahimsa.*" Those who insist on outward and superficial aspect of *Ahimsa* and stretch it to impossible limits are bound to be perplexed, like Gandhi. If anything is unobtainable in this world like the geometrical definition of a straight line, it is Gandhi's ideal of absolute external non-violence,—so different from the ideal that we find stated in the seventeenth verse of the eighteenth chapter.

It may be urged that this plea of pure motive is liable to be misused by evil doers to support their own violent actions. But everything is liable to such misuse. In the analysis of moral responsibility of action, we cannot stop at a certain point and say that we will not proceed as any further analysis is liable to be misused. Every sinner weaves a web of plausible excuses for his evil conduct. But that should not deter us from stating facts or evaluating moral ideas and ideals. Satan will quote the Bible to support himself. Shall we twist the Bible in order to make it uncitable by Satan ?

The *Gita* is not against the ideal of absolute outward *Ahimsa* but it begins in the world of motive and ends in the world of actions. It is therefore unnecessary to twist the meaning and the setting of the *Gita*. It is doing metaphysical *violence* to the *Gita*. Some of the exponents of absolute, outward *Ahimsa* have styled old historical heroes as "misguided patriots". They may go a step further and call Krishna a misguided *Awatar* and the *Gita* a misguided gospel. This course, though wrong, would be more honest than the efforts to twist the unmistakable and obvious significance of *Gita*'s setting and teaching.

It is very cruel to accuse those who explain this right and proper significance of the *Gita*, with advocacy of violence. *For the point at issue is between an external and internal definition of non-violence.* According to the *Gita* what may at times appear to be violent and cruel is often kind and non-violent. Outward appearance is due to seen and unseen circumstances (अधिष्ठानं दैवं च). The inward significance is more essential than the outward. This is brought out clearly in our verse. Importance of a particular view is often expressed in this pointed manner. Mahatma Gandhi sent, for instance, the following typical message to the *Gita* number of

Kalyan, a Hindi magazine published at Gorakhpur: "If tons of *Gita* study are placed in one scale and an ounce of *Gita* practice in the other, the latter will outweigh the former." Well, this does not mean that Gandhi is against *Gita* study. Similarly in the passage in question the *Gita* points out that "tons of outward *Himsa* will not outweigh an ounce of inward *Ahimsa*". This does not mean that the *Gita* sanctions indiscriminate or hasty action. It means that the ultimate criterion of judging the responsibility of an individual for the results of his actions, is the purity or otherwise of his motive (बुद्धिः).

G. V. KETKAR

MOTIVE AND ACTION

A NOTE ON THE ABOVE

The central idea discussed in the above article is highly important not only in national affairs but also in the personal life of every individual. Theosophy fully agrees about the supreme value of motive; motive is the soul of action. But Mr. Ketkar gives unqualified support to the doctrine that any and every action becomes righteous if the motive is pure, unselfish and noble. Theosophy would qualify this extreme view and say that not only intention and motive but also the execution of a deed and the method employed have values which must be taken into account.

First, a noble and unselfish motive or a worthy intention when not acted out produces one type of undesirable result. Many are the people who pave their way to hell with good intentions. If inner motive and intention were all in all, such people ought to find themselves very soon in a heaven of peace, wisdom and prosperity; but they do not. Why?

Secondly, how to evaluate the motive of another, when it is so very difficult to decipher one's own? If actions belong to the plane of effects motives belong to the plane of the invisible but ever potent Causality. Who can raise his mind to that level and see the vision? He who has freed himself from the pressure and influence of effects; in short an adept.

H. P. Blavatsky describes this world of Causality as "the subtle, yet never-breaking thread that is the action, agent and power of Karma, and Karma itself in the field of divine mind". (*Raja-Yoga or Occultism*, p. 25)

She adds, "Once acquainted with this no adept can any longer plead ignorance in the event of even an action, good and meritorious in its *motive*, producing evil as its result; since acquaintance with this mysterious realm gives the means to the Occultist of foreseeing the two paths opening before every premeditated as unpremeditated action, and thus puts him in a position to know with certainty

what will be the results in one or the other case."

But as we deal with the world of effects in which mortals live, move and have their being, we must learn and teach not only to make our motives pure, unselfish and enlightened, but also to take care that tangible results of our deeds are not evil, and capable of multiplying evil. Purification of motive (हेतु:) is a path in itself; and the *Gita* is not silent about it; Buddhi—the discerning power which is related to our motive (हेतु:)—is threefold, material, psychical and spiritual (*Gita*, xviii. 30–32). Part of the discipline which brings forth untaintable motive consists in the right performance of present action, which involves not only motive but also the method of action, and its tangible results. This is so important that it is necessary to quote in full these verses.

> The discerning power (Buddhi) that knows how to begin and to renounce, what should and what should not be done, what is to be feared and what not, what holds fast and what sets the soul free, is of the *sattva* quality.
>
> That discernment, O son of Pritha, which does not fully know what ought to be done and what not, what should be feared and what not, is of the passion-born *rajas* quality.
>
> That discriminating power which is enveloped in obscurity, mistaking wrong for right and all things contrary to their true intent and meaning, is of the dark quality of *tamas*.
>
> —*Gita*, xviii, 30-31-32

प्रवृत्तिं च निवृत्तिं च कार्याकार्ये भयाभये ।
बन्धं मोक्षं च या वेत्ति बुद्धिः सा पार्थ सात्त्विकी ॥ ३० ॥
यया धर्ममधर्मंच कार्यं चाकार्यमेवच ।
अयथावत्प्रजानाति बुद्धिः सा पार्थ राजसी ॥ ३१ ॥
अधर्मं धर्ममिति या मन्यते तमसावृता ।
सर्वार्थान् विपरीतांश्च बुद्धिः सा पार्थ तामसी ॥ ३२ ॥

—श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासु अष्टादशोऽध्याये ।

DRUIDISM

I

[**W. Arthur Peacock** sketches the interesting belief of a prehistoric people. We append notes which tell what Theosophy has to say on the subject.—EDS.]

Much has been written concerning the glories of Ancient Rome, the wonders of Ancient Egypt, and the wisdom of Ancient Greece. The discoveries of recent years in the Valley of the Kings have served to focus attention upon the Pyramids of Egypt and upon the religious faith associated with them. The philosophy of the Orient has been explained to the Occident and the literature dealing with the religions of the East has in recent years been considerably added to. Such learned men and women as Godfrey Higgins, Gerald Massey, Max Müller, Sir Edwin Arnold, Madame Blavatsky and Wallis Budge have each endeavoured to tell of the wonder, beauty, and reason of the religious faiths that were nourished by the peoples of the ancient Indian, Persian and Egyptian civilisations. Yet while much has been accomplished in this direction, little has been done to explain the faith of Ancient Britain or the monuments associated with its religious worship.

Men wander towards Salisbury Plain and gaze upon the great monument of antiquity. At once they are interested. They become eager to learn what is known regarding it. "Who built it," they ask. "Who were the Druids?" "In what did they believe?" They buy a local handbook but this adds little to their knowledge. They turn to the bookshelves of their local libraries to find that even here little help is forthcoming. Literature dealing with the Ancient Faith is scarce. It has been written for a few since only a tiny minority have displayed an interest in the ideals of belief and have sought to unravel the mysteries of the past. That this should be is regrettable, for the religion of the Ancient Druids was one that was established in wisdom and in beauty. Rightly, Theodore Watts Dunton spoke of it as "the mysterious poetic religion, which more than any other religion, expresses the very voice of nature".

Few faiths have been more misrepresented or so little understood as that of Druidism. Julius Cæsar spread the notion that the Druids were savage and ignorant men and that idea has been handed down and generally accepted through the years. H. G. Wells in his *Outline of History* (Vol. I, 78) paints a typical picture and reveals his attachment to the Julius Cæsar idea. He says:

> Away beyond the dawn of history, 3,000 or 4,000 years ago, one thinks of the Wiltshire uplands in the twilight of a midsummer day's morning. The torches pale in the glowing light. One has a dim apprehension of a procession through the avenue of stone, of priests,

perhaps fantastically dressed with skins and horns and horrible painted masks—not the robed and bearded dignitaries our artists represent the Druids to have been—of chiefs in skins adorned with necklaces of teeth and bearing spears and axes, their great heads of hair held up with pins of bone, of women in skins or flaxen robes, of a great peering crowd of shock-headed men and naked children. They have assembled from many distant places; the ground between the avenues and Silbury Hill is dotted with their encampments. A certain festive cheerfulness prevails. And amidst the throng march the appointed human victims, submissive, helpless, staring towards the distant smoking altar at which they are to die . . .

that the harvest may be good and the tribe increased.

To paint a picture of our ancestors as savage and ignorant men is very easy. To prove its truth is much more difficult, for the word of Julius Cæsar lacks confirmation. A more balanced view is advanced by Professor Wingfield Stratford in that great scholastic work *The History of British Civilisation*. He comments:—

First impressions are notoriously the strongest and the earliest authority on the Gaulish cult, which was said to have been derived from that of Britain is furnished by the memoirs of the Roman proconsul, Julius Cæsar. A soldier politician, writing up his own career as a conqueror of Gaul, was not likely to be the most sympathetic commentator on his victim's religion. It is as if the young Arthur Wellesly had inserted into an account of his campaigns two or three paragraphs dealing with the Hindu religious philosophy. Would not he have summed up the matter in a sentence "The Nation is exceedingly devoted to superstitious rites". . . .

The best proof after all that a lofty faith did exist in England hundreds of years before the coming of the Romans, is that such a faith is still able to speak to us in language more direct and conclusive than that of any book. The great Temple of Stonehenge whether it be Druid or pre-Druid, represents an advance in constructional technique, beyond the larger and probably even more imposing Avebury. Stonehenge is as eloquent in ruin, as Amiens and Westminster, and he must be dull indeed who can stand in the shadow of those enormous trilithons and fail to realise that the men who compassed the immense achievement,—so immense that even modern writers have been found who attribute it to magic—of transporting and erecting this, for all mundane purposes, quite useless edifice, must have had dreams and aspirations, and a leisure to indulge in them that we, of a hustled and nerve racked generation, may well envy them.

What were the essential tenets of this lofty faith? Dr. Stukeley has written that the best way to appreciate the wonder of Stonehenge is to enter it blindfolded. It was in this manner that the novitiate was led into the circle in olden times. Not until he reached the heart of the Circle was the bandage removed. By this means the lesson was taught that just as the pupil seemed small beside the great trilithons so too was man when compared with the universe around him. From the heart of the Circle the pupil looked to the Prostrate Stone which lies between the Circle and the Gnomen or "Hele" stone at the entrance. It is this stone which modern Journalists have labelled "The sacrificial stone" and upon it, it is said, were laid the victims of the Druids.

A perusal of Druid ideals leads to another explanation, an explanation which shows that there was beauty and wisdom associated with this ancient faith. To the Druids this stone was known as the stone of Mor-Morthair, the stone of Motherhood. Says the Ancient Ritual:—

She who has given all she had to give looks back from the place of sacrifice to the glory of beyond. The Mother Spirit looks with joy upon the Circle that her Son has drawn around the Place of Brightness and Delight and rejoices in the task of her life. This Prostrate Stone is the symbol of the great sacrifice of self. Here self is sacrificed that goodness may abound. By the death of self upon the Sacrificial stone, the Spirit now directs towards the Circle of life's hope. When self is lost in highest thought of life, true happiness is found. Blessed are they who cast all selfishness aside beside the Stone of Sacrifice and climb to heights of thought in which perfect peace is found.

Much of the Druid instruction has been lost for it was principally of an oral character but the fragments that have been preserved serve to emphasise the wisdom, broadmindedness and tolerance of the ideal. It was believed that life had its origin in a point of existence called Annwn, the utter darkness. From this point man passed by a regular graduation until the highest conceivable state of happiness was attained. The teachings of Islam have much in common with the Druid ideal.

There are times when reading the *Koran* it seems as though it is the Bardic teachings that lie before us.

The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, are cardinal teachings of the Druids. The Druid Conception of the Infinite was one of All-Love and of All-Mercy. The ordinary evangelists would find little to their liking in the old philosophy. The idea that a man's death upon a cross would save the world would not be countenanced by the Druids. The doctrine of salvation by deputy found no place within their teaching. They taught that every man must bear his own burden and that as men sow so do they reap. The Druids believed that the law of eternal justice prevailed through all, that every man and woman had their place in the great scheme of things, that nothing happened by mere coincidence or chance, but that all things revealed the great purpose. Much within their teaching is in full keeping with the religious ideals of Egypt, India, Persia and would serve to prove that in days far away there did exist a great Universal religion, the ruins of which still stand in the form of the megalithic monuments of Persia, Brittany, Egypt, Ireland and elsewhere to remind us of our indebtedness to the past.

I am tempted to make many quotations from the old Bardic teachings in order to show the excellence of the earliest religious ideal to be nourished in this country. But I will rest content with just the following which perhaps will do something at least to prove that Druidism was not the out-birth of savage minds.

Three things which do not become a godly man: to look with one eye; to

listen with one ear; and to help with one hand.

The three measuring rods of every man: his God; his devil and his indifference.

The three foundations of piety: active justice, perceptive truth and energetic love.

The three necessities of goodness: knowledge, consideration and happiness.

In these days Druidism has become numbered among the forgotten faiths of other days. Only a tiny section of the community give consideration to its great message. Only a few seek to unravel the great mystery of its ruined shrines. This much, however, is certain, Druidism was a faith wedded to reason. It was not a narrow, sectarian teaching but a Universalist faith. Of that faith Madame Blavatsky has rightly written:—

"On the dead soil of the long bygone past stand their sacred oaks, now dried up and stripped of their spiritual meaning by the venomous breath of materialism. But for the student of occult learning, their vegetation is still verdant and luxuriant, and as full of deep and sacred truths."

W. ARTHUR PEACOCK

II

[**H. P. Blavatsky's** writings yield a wealth of information, from which the following is extracted.—EDS.]

Druids. A sacerdotal caste which flourished in Britain and Gaul. They were Initiates who admitted females into their sacred order, and initiated them into the mysteries of their religion. They never entrusted their sacred verses and scriptures to writing, but, like the Brahmans of old, committed them to memory; a feat which, according to the statement of Cæsar, took twenty years to accomplish. Like the Parsis they had no images or statues of their gods. The Celtic religion considered it blasphemy to represent any god, even of a minor character, under a human figure. It would have been well if the Greek and Roman Christians had learnt this lesson from the "pagan" Druids. The three chief commandments of their religion were:—"Obedience to divine laws; concern for the welfare of mankind; suffering with fortitude all the evils of life".—*Theosophical Glossary* ("Druids").

The thirteen Mexican serpent-gods bear a distant relationship to the thirteen stones of the Druidical ruins.—*Isis Unveiled.* I, 572

The Druids of the Celto-Britannic regions also called themselves snakes. "I am a Serpent, I am a Druid!" they exclaimed. The Egyptian Karnak is twin-brother to the Carnac of Bretagné, the latter Carnac meaning the serpent's mount. The Dracontia once covered the surface of the globe, and these temples were sacred to the dragon, only because it was the symbol of the sun, which, in its turn, was the symbol of the highest god—the Phœnician Elon or Elion, whom Abraham recognized as El Elion. (See Sanchoniaton in "Eusebius," Pr. Ev. 36; Genesis xiv.) Besides the surname of serpents, they were called the "builders," the "architects"; for the immense grandeur of their temples and monuments was such, that even now the pulverized remains of them "frighten the mathematical calculations of our modern engineers," says Taliesin.—*Isis Unveiled.* I, 554

The Druidical circles, the Dolmen, the Temples of India, Egypt and Greece, the Towers and the 127 towns in Europe which were found "Cyclopean in origin" by the French Institute, are all the work of initiated Priest-Architects, the descendants of those primarily taught by the "Sons of God," justly called "The Builders."—*The Secret Doctrine.* I, 209

These "hinging stones" of Salisbury Plain are believed to be the remains of a Druidical temple. But the Druids were historical men and not Cyclopes, nor giants. Who then, *if not giants, could ever raise such masses* (especially those at Carnac and West Hoadley), range them in such symmetrical order that they should represent the planisphere, and place them in such wonderful equipoise that they seem hardly to touch the ground, are set in motion at the slightest touch of the finger, and would yet resist the efforts of twenty men who should attempt to displace them.

We say, that most of these stones are the relics of the last Atlanteans. We shall be answered that all the geologists claim them to be of a natural origin. . . . . Let us examine the case.—*The Secret Doctrine.* II, 343

In the gods of Stonehenge we recognise the divinities of Delphi and Babylon, and in those of the latter the devas of the Vedic nations.—*The Secret Doctrine* II, 379

The mystery veiling the origin and the religion of the Druids, is as great as that of their supposed fanes is to the modern Symbologist, but not to the initiated Occultists. Their priests were the descendants of the last Altanteans, and what is known of them is sufficient to allow the inference that they were eastern priests akin to the Chaldeans and Indians, though little more. It may be inferred that they symbolized their deity as the Hindus do their Vishnu, as the Egyptians did their *Mystery God*, and as the builders of the Ohio Great-Serpent mound worshipped theirs—namely under the form of the "mighty Serpent," the emblem of the eternal deity TIME (the Hindu Kâla). Pliny called them the "Magi of the Gauls and Britons." But they were more than that. The author of "*Indian Antiquities* finds much affinity between the Druids and the Brahmins of India. Dr. Borlase points to a close analogy between them and the Magi of Persia;—(But the Magi of Persia were never Persians—not even Chaldeans. They came from a far-off land, the Orientalists being of opinion that the said land was Media. This may be so, but from what part of Media? To this we receive no answer.)—others will see an identity between them and the Orphic priesthood of Thrace: simply because they were connected, in their esoteric teachings, with the universal Wisdom Religion, and thus presented affinities with the exoteric worship of all.

Like the Hindus, the Greeks and Romans (we speak of the Initiates), the Chaldees and the Egyptians, the Druids believed in the doctrine of a succession of worlds, as also in that of seven "creations" (of new continents) and transformations of the face of the earth, and in a seven-fold night and day for each earth or globe (See "*Esoteric Buddhism*"). Wherever the Serpent with the egg is found, there this tenet was surely present. Their *Dracontia* are a proof of it. Their belief was so universal that, if we seek for it in the esotericism of various religions, we shall discover it in all.

—*The Secret Doctrine.* II, 756

THE VISION OF JOHN KEATS

[**John Middleton Murry's** intimacy with the mind of Keats is revealed to the careful reader of his *Keats and Shakespeare.* In the following article he presents the psychological Drama of the Soul which lived in the masque of John Keats a little over a century ago.

We are not told why Keats should have passed through so "extraordinary" an experience, and that "so quickly and so young". Esoteric Science teaches that every human soul very quickly passes through its own evolution in previous lives, just as the fœtus rapidly passes through æons of evolution in the short period of nine months. It also teaches that, on occasions, Chelas under training on their way to the Great Perfection, incarnate in a state which is described as that of a "resting-adept"—so named because these souls are resting for a while from the arduous duties of their real vocation and even its memory, while engaging themselves with creative activity, generally in the realm of high art or philosophy. Was Keats a resting-adept? Or was he but a reincarnation of the soul approaching the Path to the Holy Ones—purifying himself through suffering, and strengthening himself through service of human minds?

The sub-headings are our own.—EDS.]

In the brief and wonderful life of John Keats there is a definite moment at which he became a *great* poet—a moment at which this boy in years of twenty-three, passed suddenly into the company of Shakespeare, and reached a height which no English poet, save perhaps Shakespeare himself, has attained. This moment is the writing of the great *Odes*—"To a Nightingale," "On a Grecian Urn," "To Melancholy". They were written in the spring of 1819—between the middle of April and the end of May. There was one equally great Ode to come after, in September, "To Autumn". But the crucial happening was in the Spring.

It looks miraculous. It looks miraculous when we leave a swelling bud overnight and come down to the garden in the morning to find it burst into flower. Yet, if we had had patience to watch it through the night, the discontinuity which makes the apparent miracle, would have been continuous. *Natura non facit saltus*: Nature never makes a leap, says the old profound maxim. But, alas, we are not always in a position to watch Nature at her work. Sometimes the fault is in ourselves: we lack the patience and disinterestedness. Sometimes, above all in the case of the growth of those natural beings called men, the natural process is hidden from our most patient vision. There is a silence which we cannot penetrate—those "silent workings of the spirit" of which Keats himself spoke.

These "silent workings of the spirit" are not supernatural. They are merely hidden from our eyes. There is nothing supernatural in the sudden emergence of great poetry; nothing supernatural in what we are accustomed to call

"inspiration," even though the word itself records a time when it appeared to a more naïve understanding that the "spirit of prophecy" was "breathed into" the living man. Great prophecy, great poetry always look miraculous; but that is because we take the simple miracle of existence for granted. We do not say, or think, that the bud is "inspired" to burst into flower. For us, creatures of habit, it just flowers. The happening is ordinary; we have seen it happen ten thousand times. The miracle, the inspiration, is reserved for the happening with which we are not familiar. And least familiar of all to men is that attitude of great prophet-poets which denies the familiarity of anything. It is a queer paradox—the queerest of all: that the prophet-poet then seems to men most miraculous when he denies the miraculous.

> Behold, the lilies of the field! They toil not, neither do they spin; but Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

There goes the miracle of Solomon! Solomon the wonder, Solomon the legend,—a candle-flame against the magnificence of the tiny lilies the gaping peasants were treading underfoot while they listened.

> To see the world in a grain of sand
> And a heaven in a wild flower—

Such are, said William Blake, "the auguries of innocence". And innocence *denies* the miraculous, just as the earlier innocence of the child has no conception of the miraculous. For where everything is miracle, nothing is miraculous. That is why the prophet-poet Jesus said "Except ye become as little children ye can in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven". For what he meant by the Kingdom of Heaven was simply the condition in which everything is miraculous because nothing is miraculous. It seems astonishingly simple to me, and yet I find that others have great difficulty in understanding the condition.

It is easy enough to get thousands of men to-day to agree that nothing is miraculous; it is, indeed, an axiom of modern thinking. In such a mere negation the modern mind is at home. But when you add: "Because everything is equally miraculous" the cheerful acquiescence passes into a stony, and uncomprehending stare. If I say, what I profoundly believe, that "Nothing is supernatural," I am modern and acceptable. If I go on to say, "*Everything is natural,*" a slight unease is apparent. If I go further and say, everything that is, is natural, *as it is*; but becomes unnatural, a chimera of the brain, when you have turned it into something else, something that is not," then the hard bright modern mind looks at me askance, as though I were an active enemy. I am not that; I am simply a man who sees, very plainly, that you can only blot out from the human mind the miracle of the supernatural by opening men's eyes to the miracle of the natural. You can drive out worship of the thing that is not,

only by initiating men into worship of the thing that *is*; religion must be annihilated; but it can only be annihilated by Religion.

"Grow as the flower grows"—*Light on the Path*

Keats was a poet-prophet. He was one of those who initiated men into the worship of the thing that is; who fought, thus positively, against the worship of the thing that is not. In order to initiate men into the worship of the thing that is, you need to have been initiated yourself—to have initiated yourself. This is a slow and painful process. The extraordinary thing about Keats is that he accomplished it so quickly and so young. One might almost say: too quickly and too young. Keats' life is a wonderful, natural happening; but it is also the most completely painful life of which I know. To watch it, to re-live it, as one must if one is to watch it truly, is a torment almost beyond human endurance. I confess that there are whole months when I am *afraid* to read Keats' letters—the letters of the man who said, so simply, the simple truth about great poetry: that "if it come not naturally as the leaves to a tree, it had better not come at all".

"Naturally," not easily. As in the physical order the birth of a child is natural, nothing more natural, but comes with labour and pain; so in the subtler organic order, to which the birth of great poetry belongs, travail and suffering are the condition of delivery. In Keats the suffering and the travail are terribly concentrated. It all happens in less than a year.

There were three brothers, without father or mother, bound to each other by intimate and passionate affection. Tom, the youngest, was fatally ill with consumption; George, the eldest, had fallen in love with an adorable girl. To be able to marry her, he had to emigrate to America. That is how things stood in June 1818; this is how Keats felt about them:—

> Now I am never alone without rejoicing that there is such a thing as death—without placing my ultimate in dying for a great human purpose. Perhaps if my affairs were in a different state, I should not have written the above—you shall judge: I have two brothers; one is driven, by the "burden of Society," to America; the other with an exquisite love of life, is in a lingering state. My love for my Brothers, from the early loss of our parents, and even from earlier misfortunes, has grown into an affection "passing the love of women". I have been ill-tempered with them—I have vexed them—but the thought of them has always stifled the impression that any woman might otherwise have made upon me. I have a sister too, and may not follow them either to America or to the grave. Life must be undergone. . ."
>
> (*Letter to Bailey*, 10 June, 1818)

George departed for America. John, to have something to distract his mind from his own misery, went with his friend Brown on a long and arduous walking tour in Scotland. In two months he was back in London, himself seriously ill with what he must have known, though he dared not admit it to himself, was consumption. His darling Tom, with whom he lived alone in Hampstead, was nearing the end. For three months Keats endured the agony of watching him slowly die. While watching, he wrote "Hyperion"—the beginning of his poetic greatness. On December 1st Tom died. The pressure lifted, straightway Keats fell in love with Fanny Brawne. Another month, and the consumption is at his throat again. It begins to be clear to him, though he dares not admit it, that he will never marry Fanny. Fate will deny him everything. There is nothing that will not be taken from him. Then he writes "The Eve of St. Agnes"—a dream of his love's fruition, a dream which he *knows* is a dream. It is, with "Hyperion," the greatest of his long poems. Then comes silence, then the *Odes*.

But fortunately for us, fortunately for the world, this silence—this "tedious agony" as he called it—was only a poetic silence. Keats could write no poetry. But he could and did write a long and marvellous letter—taken up one day, dropped the next, begun on February 14th and ending on May 3—a letter it must be of 25,000 words, almost a book in itself, and assuredly for sheer simple profundity, one of the greatest books in the English language. It is the record of Keats' initiation into the worship of the things that *are*—of the things that are happening to him.

"Woe to them who live without suffering"—*Secret Doctrine*

The whole of this letter, even its seeming irrelevancies, is relevant to this process of initiation. It is the story, told from day to day, of the re-birth of a great soul. In this essay I can do no more than emphasize two of its crucial moments. The first comes on the 19th of March. He has had a letter from a friend telling him of a misfortune. And Keats begins to muse.

> This is the world—thus we cannot expect to give away many hours to pleasure. Circumstances are like clouds continually gathering and bursting. While we are laughing, the seed of some trouble is put into the wide arable land of events—while we are laughing it sprouts, it grows, and suddenly bears a poison-fruit which we must pluck. Even so we have leisure to reason on the misfortunes of our friends; our own touch us too nearly for words. Very few men have arrived at a complete disinterestedness of Mind. . . .

The seed of trouble (as we have seen) had been put into the wide arable land of events for Keats. The poison-flower that he must pluck was before him: the certain premonition of death was there before his mind—death that would rob him of all he desired, all he deserved—"verse, fame, and beauty". His misfortunes were touching him "too nearly for words". He could not speak of his love even to his brother, he could not utter himself in poetry any more.

We see, then, what is at the back of Keats' thought in his dream of the possibility of "complete disinterestedness of mind". He conceives the possibility of

becoming completely detached from himself. The mere conception, at this moment of absolute despair, of suffering almost unimaginable, is heroic. John Keats suffers agony; yet he whispers to himself: May there not be something in John Keats that can watch his suffering, lucid and unperturbed? And, of course, by adamantine spiritual law, the conception of the possibility makes it straightway reality. Immediately, Keats has a marvellous vision of human life. Men are, he sees, fundamentally creatures of animal instinct.

> The greater part of men make their way with the same instinctiveness, the same unwandering eye from their purposes, the same animal eagerness as the Hawk. The Hawk wants a Mate, so does the man—look at them both, they set about it and procure one in the same manner—they get their food in the same manner. The noble animal Man for his amusement smokes his pipe—the Hawk balances about the clouds—that is the only difference between their leisure. This it is that makes the amusement of Life to a speculative (*i. e.* a "contemplative") mind—I go among the fields and catch a glimpse of a stoat or a field-mouse peeping out of the withered grass—the creature hath a purpose and his eyes are bright with it. I go amongst the buildings of a city and I see a man hurrying along—to what? The creature has a purpose and his eyes are bright with it. But then, as Wordsworth says, "we have all one human heart—". There is an electric fire in human nature tending to purify—so that among these human creatures there is continually some birth of new heroism.

This is profound, and it is profoundly beautiful. Nor would it be profound, were it not profoundly beautiful. "Beauty is Truth, Truth Beauty," Keats was in a little while to declare, in one of his two greatest Odes. Here we see what he meant by it. If that vision of human life were not beautiful, it would not be true. Utter that same truth cynically, with hatred, and it ceases to be true; utter it wonderingly, with love, and it is true. And because it is beautiful and true, it is *complete.* Keats sees that "there is an electric fire in human nature tending to purify—so that among these human creatures there is continually some birth of new heroism".

"Stern and exacting is the Virtue of Viraga"

—Voice of the Silence

Obviously; for this birth of new heroism is taking place in Keats himself at the very moment that he is writing. He does not know it; but we *see* it. It is the birth of the heroism of utter detachment, of that complete disinterestedness of which he has conceived the possibility. On he goes, therefore. Nothing can stop him now. The new birth has begun. Its process is inevitable.

> Even here, though I myself am pursuing the same instructive course as the veriest human animal you can think of —I am, however, young—writing at random, straining at particles of light in the midst of a great darkness, without knowing the bearing of any one assertion, of any one opinion—yet may I not in this be free from sin? May there not be superior beings, amused with any graceful, though instinctive, attitude my mind may fall into as I am entertained with the alertness of the stoat or the anxiety of a deer? Though a quarrel in the streets is a thing to be hated, the energies displayed in it are fine; the commonest man shows a grace in his quarrel. (Seen) by a superior being our reasonings may take the same tone—though erroneous, they may be fine. This is the very thing in which consists poetry, and if so it is not so fine a thing as philosophy—for the same reason that an eagle is not so fine a thing as a truth.

Still more profound, and more profoundly beautiful. But people find it hard to understand. Keats has become utterly detached from himself, at the very moment that he is making his supreme discovery. These are, I sometimes think, the most astonishing words in the whole great English language—the extreme pinnacle of English poetic consciousness—universal and miraculous. *Keats is himself become that Superior Being whose existence he imagines.* He sees that Keats in this very moment of supreme poetic striving is simply an animal, straining instinctively (with the anxiety of a deer) "after particles of light in a great darkness"; he sees Keats, now at this instant, as a graceful animal. He thus sees Keats the poet. He sees that his reasonings, though erroneous, may be fine. He sees that poetry, which is this instinctive attitude of the total being, is not so fine a thing as Philosophy. But *what* is this Philosophy? Why, nothing but what Keats, the Superior Being, Keats detached from John Keats the poet, is doing now. He has achieved the final vision. He is become a completely disinterested—not a Man, for the man Keats is what the Superior Being is watching,—a completely disinterested Spirit. He *is* Spirit.

"Look inward: thou art Buddha"—*Voice of the Silence*

Suddenly, he says: "Give me this credit—Do you not think I strive—to know myself." We do, we do! There is no such marvellous act of self-knowledge, of self-annihilation recorded in the whole history of English literature.

Within a month he had begun the composition of the most wonderful sequence of *great* poems in our language. Within a month he had consolidated his victory. He knew what had happened to him. He had passed through the "Vale of Soul-making"; he had been re-born, with that "eternal rebirth of the soul" of which the mystics speak. He writes:—

> The common cognomen of this world among the misguided and superstitious is "a vale of tears" from which we are to be redeemed by a certain arbitrary interposition of God and taken to Heaven. What a little, circumscribed, straightened notion! Call the world if you please "The Vale of Soul-Making"—Soul as distinguished from an Intelligence. There may be intelligences or sparks of the divinity in millions—but they are not Souls till they acquire identities, till each one is personally itself. Intelligences are atoms of perception—they know and they see and they are pure, in short they are God. How then are Souls to be made? How then are these sparks which are God to

have identity given them—so as ever to possess a bliss peculiar to each one's individual existence? How but by the medium of a world like this? This point I sincerely wish to consider because I consider it a grander system of salvation than the Christian religion—or rather it is a system of Spirit-creation. . .

I will put it in the most homely form possible. I will call the *World* a School instituted for the purpose of teaching little children to read—I will call the *human heart* the *horn book* read in that school—and I will call the *Child able to read, the Soul* made from that *School* and its *horn book*. Do you not see how necessary a World of Pains and trouble is to school an Intelligence and make it a Soul? A Place where the heart must feel and suffer in a thousand diverse ways. Not merely is the Heart a Horn book, it is the Mind's Bible, it is the Mind's experience, it is the text from which the Mind or Intelligence sucks its identity. As various as the lives of Men are—so various, become their Souls, and thus does God make individual beings, Souls, identical Souls (*i.e.* souls having an identity or "individuality") of the sparks of his own essence.

Thus the Soul for Keats, is, integral with the Body; it is the total organism as shaped by life. But if that were the whole truth, every man or woman would possess a soul. Keats does not mean that, or believe it. He is sketching "a grander system of *salvation* than the Christian religion". No, that man or woman alone achieves a soul who does not deny his heart; who feels deeply and does not rest content till his mind and his heart are at one. The mind must be obedient to the heart. If the mind tyrannizes over the heart, and denies its promptings, there is no soul achieved. The Soul is the *achieved* unity, what I have elsewhere claled "the metabiological unity," of Man. Mere biological unity, which all living men must needs possess, is soullessness. The soul is the re-integrated man.

There is nothing mysterious, nothing magical about it. What Keats is trying to tell his brother is to him self-evident. "Do you not *see*?" he cries. And, indeed, we have only to look; but, for some reason, that looking is difficult. There is nothing esoteric about the truth. If it were esoteric, it would not be true. But it takes some discovering. You can't have it for nothing; neither can you have it for money. "It is bought with the price of all that a man hath."

We have seen how Keats paid the price. All that he had, all that he was, was put away from him. He withdrew from himself; and since it was impossible that *he* should withdraw from himself, it was an Other that withdrew from him—an impersonal Other, a Superior Being, who watched, with a lucid and tender love, the poet John Keats "straining after particles of light in the midst of a great darkness". John Keats strove, with absolute courage, absolute self-devotion, after "particles of light". That Other who watched him was the Light itself. And it dwelt in John Keats.

To that Light it was all utterly simple, as it is. Whenever a man sees that it is all utterly simple, the Light dwells in him. For that moment of simple seeing he is become the Light. He is not himself any more, but only the Light: the Light which veritably sees that

> Beauty is Truth, Truth Beauty-that is all
> Ye know on earth and all ye need to know.

And that, I am convinced, is the secret, the open secret, of the riddle of life. It is too simple for words: not too difficult, but too simple for words. So it seemed to Keats. He went on:—

> It is pretty generally suspected that the Christian scheme has been copied from the ancient Persian and Greek Philosophers. Why may they not have made *this simple thing even more simple* for common apprehension by introducing Mediators and Personages in the same manner as in the heathen mythology abstractions are personified? Seriously, I think it probable that this system of Soul making may have been the parent of all the more palpable and personal Schemes of Redemption among the Zoroastrians, the Christians and the Hindoos. For as one part of the human species must have their carved Jupiter; so another part must have the palpable and named Mediator and Saviour, their Christ, their Oromanes, and their Vishnu.

Well, it may be that the end of that dispensation is coming nearer; and that a new dispensation is beginning in the only place where it can begin—in the heart and minds of individual men, who, like John Keats, have sacrificed their all in straining after particles of light in a great darkness, and by that simple act of heroism have become the vehicles of the Light itself.

J. MIDDLETON MURRY

This earth, O ignorant Disciple, is but the dismal entrance leading to the twilight that precedes the valley of true light—that light which no wind can extinguish, that light which burns without a wick or fuel.

Saith the Great Law: "In order to become the KNOWER of ALL SELF, thou hast first of SELF to be the knower." To reach the knowledge of that SELF, thou hast to give up Self to Non-Self, Being to Non-Being, and then thou canst repose between the wings of the GREAT BIRD. Aye, sweet is rest between the wings of that which is not born, nor dies, but is the AUM throughout eternal ages.

Bestride the Bird of Life, if thou would'st know.

Give up thy life, if thou would'st live.

—THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE

A NEW PATH TO RACIAL AMITY

[**Jagadisan M. Kumarappa** is well known to our readers. In this article he pleads for a cause very dear to THE ARYAN PATH.—EDS.]

The most outstanding achievement of the past century is the creation of a neighbourhood out of the far-flung countries of the world, and the most stupendous task awaiting the present century, we may venture to say, is the task of converting this neighbourhood into a brotherhood. But is it possible to create a single fraternity out of the many and heterogeneous racial groups? True, the contributions of science have helped to break down the physical barriers; but then, what of the other obstacles which, having sprung up, militate against the union of the different races of mankind? In place of the natural boundaries, artificial modes of exclusion, such as the immigration laws, prohibitive tariffs, passport regulations and the like, have been put up, and men go on living as though the old limitations were still real. These new obstructions, being artificial, are, as the poet Tagore says, not only a burden to the people but by the might of their dead material create deformities in their moral nature. Hence such obstacles tend to keep the different races spiritually apart though they have come physically near.

Modern nationalism is the strongest democratic passion and it is that that is really driving the nations to ruin. Moved by this passion the intellectuals in every country are doing their best to exasperate national hatreds, spread untruthful propaganda and sell their brains to the War Offices and Navy Departments of their respective governments. It is small wonder, therefore, if the nations of the world are controlled by evil passions which induce destructive influences. For instance, race pride generates contempt and hatred of others; greed for wealth and power makes the strong exclude the weak from the benefits of their civilization; commercial and political avarice exploits the helpless and their lands; suspicion and distrust of other nations,—equally powerful,—eats away the heart of international friendship and co-operation. In brief, by creating a social atmosphere which continually emanates such collective ideas as are prejudicial to interracial understanding, nationalism is breaking up the wholeness of human society. It is depriving man of the greatness of his purpose and his society, of the beauty of its completeness. Therefore international jealousy, commercial gluttony and rivalry, the race for armaments and the revolt of subject races are threatening the world with a universal disruption.

When we are thus menaced by the spirit of nationalism, is there any way of ushering in the reign

of peace, of creating a brotherhood of races? In spite of the disquieting aspects of the present world situation, one must admit that there are signs of the coming of a better day. Just as the French Revolution rejuvenated Europe in thought and life, so also the Great European War released new thought currents and spiritual forces. As a result thinking men everywhere have been, and are, seriously preaching for ways and means to usher in a new era in international friendship. Dr. Tagore is perhaps the first among them to point out that universal peace could be established only by helping mankind to realize a unity wider in range, deeper in sentiment and stronger in power than ever before. Since our problem is great and complex, we have to solve it on a bigger scale by a larger faith, to realize the God in man on a sure and world-wide basis. And for the purpose of this New Age, it is necessary, he maintains, to establish education on the basis, not of nationalism, but of a wider relationship of humanity, and to create opportunities for revealing different peoples to one another.

So long as the different nations and races remain alien to each other in sentiment and culture, there will continue to be these unhappy barriers which now exist between governments. And, as a consequence, the different countries must continue to constitute hostile and often fortified camps, each viewing its neighbours with apprehension and enmity. What does an American, for instance, know of the Japanese civilization or, for that matter, of Indian culture? How can an Australian understand or sympathise with a Finn or a Lett, of whose thought and habits of life he has little or no knowledge? No doubt, some efforts are being made by national leaders to bring about unity and better understanding through leagues, treaties and the like. Certainly such attempts are praiseworthy, and do deserve every encouragement from well-meaning people. Nevertheless, it must be pointed out that unless and until the different races have a more sympathetic understanding of other peoples' cultures, these measures can, at best, produce only an artificial and, therefore, a fragile security. Universal and lasting peace can be attained only when human beings the world over have gained that sympathy which only a greater solidarity and unity of culture can bring about.

True it is that different nations do have varied accidental interests,—and there they can seldom meet, but they also have a region of common aspirations,—the region of culture,—where they can all meet. Hence culture, being the achievement, not of the nation but of the people, is free from conflicting interests, and as such provides a common meeting place, for racial and international co-operation. Many thoughtful men have now become keenly alive to the importance of cultural co-operation as a means to the promotion of goodwill and racial understand-

ing. The Committee of Intellectual Co-operation, for example, was created as an organ of the League of Nations for the purpose of promoting the real unity of nations in the affairs of the mind. The Assembly of the League seeks through the C. I. C. not only to explain to the young throughout the world the principles and work of the League of Nations but also to familiarize them with the idea that international co-operation is the normal and healthful method of managing the affairs of the world. Prof. Alfred Zimmern, the Director of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation holds, like the poet Tagore, that the problems of the modern world demand a special kind of education in which world-consciousness is substituted for national consciousness; further, he maintains that only through a widespread understanding of the differences in national viewpoints can real international co-operation be attained. With these objects in view he brings together every summer a group of the best students from thirty or forty countries to study in Geneva the problems of racial amity and of international friendship. Lectures on these problems are given by men of unquestioned reputation, and the fact that the school is held in Geneva is considered in itself significant, for it enables the students to study the present-day problems in the laboratory where expreriments in international co-operation are being made. The work of this Institute has met with marked success during the decade of its existence and it must be said to its credit, the problems of international relations have not yet been approached elsewhere in so broad a manner.

Similarly the Institute of International Education was founded in the United States immediately after the War for the purpose of cultivating friendly relations between America and the foreign countries through educational agencies. With this objective, the Institute has been organizing and encouraging such activities as the exchange of professors and other intellectuals, the establishment of interchange of student fellowships, the planning of conferences on international education and the publication of books and pamphlets on the systems of education obtaining in different parts of the world. It has also been instrumental in establishing many of the present exchange fellowships between Europe and America. In like manner several Cultural Associations have already been organized in the Latin American Republics for the purpose of promoting goodwill and encouraging more amicable alliance between the two Americas.

It is rather significant of the times that thoughtful citizens everywhere are very responsive to the idea of forming societies for cultural co-operation. The Hungarians, for instance, have organized an Hungarian Society in order to further the exchange of students between the Hungarian and American universities.

There are similar organizations for the cultivation of friendly relations between Italy and the United States, prominent among them being the Italia America Society and Casa Italia. In recognition of Italy's contributions to the progress of mankind, Italian students and professors are invited under the auspices of these Societies to study and lecture in American educational institutions. In turn, American students are asked to enjoy the intellectual hospitality of Italy; they are awarded fellowships to enable them to study architecture, sculpture, painting, classics and musical composition. Such associations for the exchange of cultural hospitality exist to-day in Russia, Germany, Poland, Scandinavia, France and Great Britain. These are only a few among the many organizations which are trying to promote racial amity through cultural co-operation.

The reader is perhaps now ready to ask: What about the sharing of culture between the East and the West? Though there has not really been much of that between these two hemispheres, yet a large number of students migrate from the Orient to European centres of learning. Within the last few years our student migration even to America has increased steadily. It is but natural that England, France and Holland with their Asiatic possessions, and Germany with her traditions of scientific scholarship, should have not only been interested in the Orient but also produced outstanding Orientalists and schools of Oriental Learning. But to America the Orient was not of any special interest, as she was, until recently, too much concerned with her own domestic problems. But the recent realization that Europe and America must learn more from and about the Orient has awakened a new interest in things oriental. Hence studies in Oriental culture are being popularized in many of the leading educational institutions in America. A recent investigation of more than five hundred seats of learning revealed that one hundred and eleven of them are now offering courses on the literature, philosophy and religions of the East with a total enrolment of more than six thousand students.

But where is India, the mother of philosophy and religions, in this movement for the exchange of cultural hospitality? Having played so important a rôle in the history and rise of civilization, is she not to be the fountainhead of Indian wisdom and Oriental culture? In ancient India our universities served two great purposes: they were, first of all, seats of learning where students acquired knowledge from the best products of the Indian mind; and secondly, they were centres of India's cultural hospitality where foreign students who came in quest of knowledge were welcomed as guests. But alas! our modern educational institutions are India's "alms-bowl of knowledge". There is not a single university to-day in the whole

country, with the exception of Visva-Bharati and perhaps Calcutta University, to really fulfil one or both of these functions. Even to specialize in Indian philosophy and literature a son of the soil is obliged to go to Europe! Could intellectual poverty be any greater and cultural degeneration any worse in any civilized country?

The introduction of Western learning into India at the expense of her own culture, the utilitarian objective of training Indian youth for carrying the white man's burden and the woefully low economic condition of the country have, no doubt, reduced India to this shameful state. But are we to continue to live shamelessly in this condition of cultural degradation? It is no wonder that the reproach of this situation and the pressing need for an Indian seat of learning drove the poet to set himself the task of founding an Indian University,—a centre of culture to help India concentrate her mind and to be fully conscious of herself; to seek the truth and make that truth her own wherever found; to judge by her own standard, give expression to her own creative genius and offer her wisdom to the quest which comes from other parts of the world. It is with such ideals that the poet brought Visva-Bharati into existence as the seat of Indian culture and centre of India's intellectual hospitality. During the eleven years of its existence, distinguished savants and students from different parts of the world have already been there as guests to share India's cultural achievements. By this most outstanding educational experiment, the poet has shown us how education should be not only Indianized but used to bring about a union between East and West. It is upto the rest of our universities to follow this guide-post and give effect to such ideals in the future education of India.

The Occident and the Orient are necessary to each other since they emphasize different and, not infrequently, complementary aspects of truth. The Western continents have been engaged in securing protection against physical death. On the other hand, the striving of the Eastern peoples has been, as Tagore points out, to win for man his spiritual kingdom, to lead him to life everlasting. *European society needs to-day the monastic ideal of the East, the ideal of self-discipline, and the peoples of the East need the Western ideal of citizenship, of the science of corporate living*. By their present separateness, East and West are alike in danger of losing the fruits of their age-long labours. For want of that union the East is suffering from poverty and inertia, and the West from lack of peace and happiness. In view of the spiritual impotency of Western civilization,—as disclosed by the world war,—many of the eminent sons of the West are feeling that the Occident must draw some benefit from the spiritual wealth of Asia. Observes

Professor Darwin Fox:—

> The merely material and intellectual results of Occidental civilization we cannot but confess to be astonishing; but in its tremendous and perfectly calculated mechanism we observe a fatal and monstrous *defectus* of all cultural aptitude. It is precisely on this account that the West is inevitably drifting towards a dreadful destination: we have basely bartered our spiritual heritage for a mess of machinery, and we have but to lift our eyes in order to behold the result. . . . . Now, it is just at this critical point in our history when a noble *Aryan* Table of Values needs for our very salvation to be re-discovered and imposed, that the intensive study and appreciation of Hindu culture becomes a paramount necessity.*

In order to disseminate the Aryan culture of India throughout the countries of the West, Prof. Fox suggests the establishment of foci or Nurseries of Hindu Culture in all the leading cities of Europe and America. When the West is thus turning towards the East instinctively, how pitiful it is that we, of the Orient, are unaware of its claim for succour, and fail to recognize the honour of the call to serve humanity at this hour of need!

In view of this newly awakened interest in Oriental culture, a greater effort must be made not only to revive our culture but also to establish a larger number of such cultural centres in India, China, Japan and other countries of Asia to provide common meeting ground for East and West. The recent developments indicate that we are entering upon a new era and we see the dawn of a day when there shall be no longer any East hostile to the West, nor West at enmity with the East, when, through cultural sympathy and co-operation, man's spiritual ideals will create out of the world-neighbourhood a brotherhood of races.

JAGADISAN M. KUMARAPPA

*Hindu Culture, THE ARYAN PATH, (November, 1931) pp. 781-82.

FIVE LIGHTS AT THE CROSS ROADS

III.—SIMON MAGUS

[**Geoffrey West** continues his biographical studies of important teachers who left their impress on the early years of the Christian Era. He has already written on "Ptolemy Soter" and "Apollonius of Tyana"; in our September issue will appear his essay on "Hillel"; the last of the series will be on "Simon Ben Yohai".

Those who know the history of Simon Magus have the two versions before them, that of White and of Black Magic at their option; to learn how he was "the great Power of God" one must understand his doctrine of Syzygies.—EDS.]

Apollonius had at least a biographer, and a friendly one; his contemporary, Simon the Magician, had only discreditors, controversial antagonists concerned to destroy his influence by decrying his character and his creed. The Early Christian Fathers named him the first heretic, sponsor of a powerful and dangerous Gnosticism, and in an age of bitter rivalry, when charge and counter-charge were the accepted missiles of theological discussion, they excelled themselves to paint in him the first lineaments of Antichrist. What we know of him we know in spite of his enemies, and in such a case we are bound to take the man they give us, study him in his completeness, and then, conscious of their prejudice, strip away the obvious intention, the purely negative detraction, and estimate what remains, the positive personality and teaching, at its worth.

Simon, we are told, was a native of Samaria, born in the village of Gitta some score of miles from the city of Caesarea, probably a few years before the commencement of the Christian era. He studied in Alexandria, and there became so proficient in magic as the favoured pupil of a teacher of the Hemerobaptist school (a sect of the Essenes much influenced by Gentile learning) that on his master's death he vindicated his claim to the vacant chair by a marvellous display of his powers. Before 38 A. D. he had returned to Samaria and by demonic aid gained such notoriety as a holy man and magician that it was said of him: "This man is that power of God which is called Great." About this time came into Samaria, Philip the evangelist making many converts. Simon himself saw no more in Christianity than yet another sect whose magic powers he might add to his own, and to that end became Philip's disciple. Next came Peter and John, bringing the Holy Ghost to the converted by the laying on of hands, and Simon in his impatience offered them money to initiate him to their full knowledge. Peter replied with righteous indignation: "Thy silver perish with thee, because thou hast thought to obtain this gift of God with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter; for thy heart is not right before God." Simon perceived his error and repented, begging: "Pray ye for me to the Lord, that none of the things which ye have spoken come upon me."

But his repentance, if sincere, was short-lived. Mortification followed; he "shed vain tears" and sought to be revenged upon the faith that had rejected him. Very soon he had regained his independent prestige in Samaria, and in the reign of Claudius was winning fame and followers in Rome, so astonishing the citizens by his marvellous powers that they too named him a god and set up a golden pillar or statue in his honour. He was now companioned by a Phœnician prostitute bought in a brothel at Tyre, claiming divine honours for them both, in order, it is alleged, to conceal from his own disciples the true nature of their licentious relationship. Himself he declared to be the power of God which had appeared in Samaria as the Father, to the Jews as the Son (that is, in the person of Jesus), and to the Gentiles as the Holy Spirit. His companion Helen he named "the first conception of his Mind, the Mother of all, by whom in the beginning he conceived in his Mind the making of the Angels and Archangels," and who at his will had descended to the Lower Regions to generate these Powers by whom the world was made; whereupon they detained her there, unwilling to be thought "the progeny of another," so that "she suffered every kind of indignity at their hands to prevent her re-ascending to her Father, even to being imprisoned in the human body and transmigrating into other female bodies, as from one vessel into another". It was at once to save her and to bring knowledge to men that he had come into the world; and he claimed to speak with an authority higher than that of the prophets, whose instructors were, he said, the rebellious angels of the left-hand path. Evil was not of God but of the world, and therefore whosoever believed in him and in Helen were set free from laws of the prophets to follow their own hearts—wherefore he and his followers were charged with witchcraft and immorality. They were idolators who, it was declared, gave foreign or "barbarous" names to their powers and gods.

His final defeat was brought about by Peter at Rome in the reign of Nero, despite his magic powers, which, demon-born, were phenomenal. He could cast off prison chains, fly through the air, change his form, cause statues to laugh and walk, and perform acts of divination. But Peter routed him by threatening to question the soul of a murdered boy he had enslaved for magic purposes, and he fled to Tyre and beyond. Again they met in Rome, and Simon boastfully erected a wooden tower from which to ascend to heaven in a chariot of fire. But at the critical moment Peter

uttered a prayer so vehement that the terrified demons abandoned their burden and incontinently fled, so that "the miserable fellow fell down and died". Another account, however, reveals him ending his career preaching peacefully to his disciples from under a plane tree, and displaying especial skill in the "artful misinterpretation" of the Scriptures, presenting them not as revealed truth but an allegory of dual-natured humanity struggling everlastingly toward the Divine. But even here presumption overcame him, for he compelled his followers to bury him alive that he might rise on the third day—since when, as the commentator triumphantly recorded, the world has seen him no more! After his death his followers were declared to worship him and Helen in the form of statues of Zeus and Athene, but naming them only Lord and Lady, and casting out any who addressed them personally "as one ignorant of the mysteries".

Thus far the life presented by the Christians. How much of it can we accept? The birth at Gitta surely, for all that we can gather of Simon's teaching shows him the pupil of the masters of the oral tradition in Samaria, in those days notably the meeting-ground of Jewish learning with Hellenic paganism and the older faiths of Syria and Phœnicia. His Alexandrian sojourn too, for he possessed that breadth of knowledge and understanding, that cosmopolitan syncretism, those recurrent hints of Hindu and Buddhist learning, which especially marked the students of that great city of the Serapeum. It is impossible to resist the conjecture, indeed, that whosoever may have been his especial teacher, he also came powerfully under the influence of the great Philo. That he had followers in Rome as well as in Samaria is clear. But beyond these things we fall into conjecture—often plain contradiction. Was a statue ever set up to him in Rome? Did he claim to be a re-embodiment of Jesus? Was Helen an actual woman? We cannot say, but a study of the last problem at least suggests a significant possibility.

Fortunately we can discern the main outlines of his teaching, thanks principally to the unknown author of the *Philosophumena*, who evidently had before him as he wrote (in the early third century) a copy of the works either of Simon or his immediate followers. His quotations are in fact the only authentic Simonian writings of which we have record, all else being burnt by the victorious Christians. It is, to put it at its lowest, a remarkable teaching, the system not only of a profound philosopher but a man of wide knowledge, a synthesis of the wisdom of East and West, strongly influenced by Jewish Kabbalism, and absolutely theosophical in form, in tenor, and in implication. "I say there are many gods, but one God of all these gods, incomprehensible and unknown to all . . . . My belief is that there is a Power of immeasurable and ineffable Light, whose greatness is held to be incomprehensible, a Power which the maker of the world does not know". That is the Unmanifested Root, the Great Silence, which, "producing itself by itself, manifested to itself its own Thought". Thus from the Silence the Word, the Spirit moving on the Waters, and from this manifested Monad the active Duad: Mind which is the Soul or male principle; and Thought, the Spirit or female principle, descending to bring into being the Angels and Powers which in turn are the makers of the world, sinking downward at last to the lowest depths of material manifestation, thence again to rise upward at the behest of beckoning Soul, retracing the long pathway towards perfection.

This drama of descent and return is absolutely embodied in the Simon-Helen relationship, as declared in the reported words of Simon himself. Must we suppose that he deliberately invented or adopted this profound æonology merely to conceal a sensual relationship with a wanton woman? His moral teachings accord with no such hypothesis. To declare evil "not in nature but institution," and thus set those who have found spiritual truth above the law, is not to abrogate morality, as the Christians ignorantly charged; it is but to proclaim the greater truth that true morality springs not from exterior social compulsion but from the inner nature, and that only such morality has spiritual significance. His doctrine of universal correlation by correspondence and analogy, seeing Man as the Microcosm embodying the potentialities of the all-inclusive Macrocosm, thus setting salvation in self-knowledge and a certitude of unity with God, points to a life of study and self-examination; while his insistence that the way to so-called magical power must be by the right-hand path of discipline and self-purification scarcely suggests the personality of a necromancer intent upon material satisfactions.

Simon in his own day was noted for his allegorical interpretation of the scriptures. Recalling this, and having regard for the fore-going facts, may we not ask whether what confronts us here is not a clear case of unimaginative, literal-minded critics blindly or deliberately reading a purely personal meaning into what was put forward as a figurative account of the nature and creation of the world, making for their own ignoble purposes a woman from a familiar symbol, and in a most literal sense prostituting a great and universal truth to be a lie and a calumny? If Simon indeed claimed godship, then why did his followers thrust out from their communion, as "ignorant," those who addressed his image by his name? Was it not that they consciously approached divinity rather through than in him? Seize this truth, and even the contradictory charge of Irenaeus that "he allowed himself to be called by whatever name men pleased" glows with a sudden unexpected

significance as the word of a teacher who behind the Many had discerned the One, and who must seek, as Simon in fact did, to interpret the scriptures of all nations in accordance with a timeless universal knowledge effective for all men in every age. Simon has been too often named the founder of Gnosticism—a view no longer tenable. Gnosticism, even in its special Jewish form, dates back some centuries before the Christian era, and even without Simon's Alexandrian additions its fundamental theosophical likeness is unmistakeable. It is a very ancient tradition we glimpse in the charge against his followers that they gave "barbarous" names to the gods and powers—a hint, surely, of that untranslatable "sacred dialect" or "mystery language" said to have been taught originally by the gods themselves to the ancient Egyptians!

Take the recorded details of Simon's life and teaching, strip away the evident or probable controversial additions, distortions, and calumnies, and one is left with a teaching of profundity, coherence, and theosophical content, with a man of great learning, pure life, and spiritual understanding. Whether he was a "magician," or even claimed to be, who can tell? The feats attributed to him clearly do not sort with his teaching, and may well be ignorant or malicious invention, designed to show the greater powers of the apostles. It is doubtful whether we can even believe the story related in the *Acts*. If Simon did seek to buy spiritual powers with money, then he deserved all condemnation. But the problem remains whether a man of such evident spiritual knowledge as his teachings display could, under any circumstances, make such an elementary error. It is certainly sufficiently improbable to make us wonder whether it can be regarded even as an open question.

GEOFFREY WEST

For thee there is an ascent of the soul towards Divine Light, therefore shall thy heart and soul in the end attain to union with that Light. With thy whole heart and soul, seek to regain Reality, nay, seek for Reality within thine own heart, for Reality in truth is hidden within thee: the heart is the dwelling-place of that which is the Essence of the Universe, within the heart and soul is very essence of God. Like the Saints, make a journey into thy self; like the lovers of God, cast one glance within. As a lover now, in contemplation of the Beloved, be unveiled within, and behold the Essence. Form is a veil to thee and thy heart is a veil. When the veil vanishes, thou shalt become all Light.

—*Attar* by Margaret Smith. (Wisdom of the East Series, John Murray, London. 3*s*. 6*d*.)

THE CULTURAL BOND BETWEEN CHINA AND JAPAN

[**Prof. Kiang Kang-hu** is head of the Department of Chinese Studies at the McGill University, Montreal, Canada. He has written numerous volumes, not only in Chinese but also in Japanese.—EDS.]

Because of the recent deplorable clash in the Far East between China and Japan the outside world generally thinks that these two great Oriental nations must have been incompatible in nature and age-long enemies throughout their histories. A little review of the past will reveal the untruth of this conception; on the contrary, their racial and cultural bonds are so intimate and close that a friendly co-operation and even perfect harmony between them would be not at all impossible if the international policies of both were well and wisely directed. I shall here mention only a few outstanding facts definitely recorded in our official standard dynastic histories and commonly accepted by the scholars of the two countries as silent but eloquent witnesses to my assertion.

The original name for Japan was O or O Nu, so recorded in Chinese histories. It is but a Chinese pronunciation of the name of the aborigines in Japan, Ainu, but it has a bad meaning in Chinese characters which read "short slaves". In 607 the Japanese ruler first addressed himself to Emperor Yang Ti of the Suei dynasty as "King of the Rising Sun Country," which was considered by the latter as impolite. Not until 670 of the T'ang dynasty, the name Jih Pen was definitely chosen by Japan and officially sanctioned by China. It is made of two Chinese characters: Jih meaning "Sun" and Pen meaning "Root". These Chinese words have been pronounced by the Japanese as Nippon and afterwards translated by the Westerners as Japan. This has since become the standard name for Japan and is commonly used in China, the old name O or O Nu, still quoted occasionally by the Chinese being deeply resented by the Japanese.

From the beginning of our written history Japan was also known to China as the Three Fairy Mountains (San Shen Shan). Owing to the many mystic stories told by the early Taoist Adepts, the First Emperor of the Ch'in dynasty frequently ordered official expeditions to the Eastern Sea in quest of angels and the ancient Chinese equivalent of the "Elixir of Life". The largest group of three thousand boys and girls was led by Hsü Fu (also incorrectly known as Hsü Shih) and sailed in the year 219 B. C. They reached the south tip of the main island of Japan and never returned. This is the first recorded Chinese colonization there; many more followed and doubtless even preceded this date. The tombs of Hsü Fu and six

other leaders of the expedition in Kumano are even to-day well preserved and highly revered by the Japanese. The 2,000th anniversary was celebrated three years ago by a joint effort of both the Chinese and the Japanese government officials and prominent citizens.

The aborigines of Japan, the Ainus, claimed to belong to the Slavic family of the Caucasian race, had been gradually pushed back further north by the newcomers from Korea, China and the Malay Islands; these three elements combined and mixed with a small percentage of the aborigines to make up the modern Japanese. Of the three, the Koreans were probably the major and the Malayas the minor, but since most of the Koreans were originally from China and all of them were Chinese citizens or subjects, at least three-fourths of the modern Japanese are of Chinese blood, chiefly of the Han race. Chinese surnames are not uncommon in Japan and many of the Japanese noble and scholarly clans are traceable to Chinese origins. On the other hand, even in modern times, we have General Cheng Ch'eng-kuang (known by the Japanese title as Koxinga), the great patriotic hero of the late Ming period, and Priest Man Shu, the revolutionary poet-philosopher of the late Ch'ing period, both by Japanese mothers.

As to the cultural relation, Japan is much indebted to China, her historical fatherland. I dare say that most of Japan's culture, prior to its contact with the West and aside from its modern material accomplishment, derives from China. In religions and philosophy, Confucianism is still the dominant teaching of Japanese individual, family and social life. Buddhism, with its various sects, was introduced from China and not directly from India. All Japanese Buddhist patriarchs were either disciples of Chinese priests or disciples of their disciples. During and after the T'ang dynasty, hundreds of Japanese government students enrolled in the Chinese Imperial University and thousands of Japanese Buddhist priests travelled as pilgrims and studied as disciples in Chinese monasteries throughout the Empire. Besides K'ung Hai of the T'ang mentioned below, Tiao Jan and Chi Chao of the Sung are the better known Japanese Buddhist scholars who stayed long in China. It was a common practice for Japan to appoint Buddhist priests as envoys to China, for Japanese Buddhists differed from Chinese Buddhists only in one thing, namely, the former were generally allowed to retain their secular relations as to family obligations and government services while the latter, except the Chü Shih or laymen, were obliged to sever all worldly connections and live apart from the world in temples or hermitages. This explains also the fact that Buddhist influence over politics in Japan has always been more direct and much greater than in China. This condition remains the same

to-day. The only Japanese life lost in Shanghai last January, which served as the excuse for the Japanese bombardment of the Chinese residential sections of that city, was a Buddhist priest participating in a street riot.

In the early Ch'ing period, Chu Chih-yü (better known as Chu Shun-shuei), a Chinese philosopher and member of the Ming royal family, who fled to Japan and spent his life in Edo, afterwards Tokio, was the tutor and advisor of the Tokugawa Shogunate and had among his pupils many great Japanese scholars and statesmen. Even Shintoism, which is supposed to be a primitive native religion of Japan, was not in its present shape till the introduction of the Taoist religion from China, and its very name is derived from Chinese words. Many Chinese heroes, including Hsü Fu, are among the Shinto deities for national worship.

In literature and art, the Japanese had no written language except that of the Chinese which was adapted since the beginning of our period of the six Dynasties. A Japanese Buddhist, whose name was K'ung Hai in Chinese and Kobo Daishi in Japanese, returned from his 25 years' study in China during the T'ang dynasty, invented the kanas (Japanese pronunciation for Chinese words Chia Ming meaning "borrowed terms") from Chinese writing and used them as phonetic guides to Chinese characters. Since then they have become the Japanese alphabet for modern and vernacular literature, but all important and substantial words are still Chinese. Chinese classics, prose and poetry, are standards of Japanese writers. All branches of literary and non-literary arts in Japan are greatly influenced by the precedents of Chinese schools. The historical temples of Nara and the Great Buddha of Kamakura were done by Chinese workmen. In government and society we find all systems and regulations bearing the Chinese nature, letter and spirit. Great political movements in Japanese history have been inspired or influenced by Chinese teachings. Most of the heroes in the Great Reform were followers of Wang Yang-ming's philosophy.

Many of the present-day Japanese costumes and manners are remnants of the T'ang dynasty or earlier. Japan has helped much to preserve old Chinese customs. In this respect the Japanese are decidedly more conservative than the Chinese. We often have to go to the interior of Japan to study and identify things and names recorded in our old literature which have long been lost in China and therefore the records have been rendered unintelligible to the modern Chinese.

In the Chinese Dynastic Histories, Japan was recorded as a regular tributary to China since the year 108 B. C. after the re-conquest of Korea by Emperor Wu Ti of the Western Han dynasty. In 56 A. D. of the Eastern Han, a State Seal was

granted to the ruler of Japan by Emperor Kuang-wu through the former's tribute-bearing envoy. Since that period every ten years or so we find records of Japan's official visit to the Chinese court. The tributes from Japan were usually clothes, pearls, precious stones, slave girls, etc. while the return gifts of China were in general silk, tapestries, mirrors and swords together with gold and silver money. Despite the change of many dynasties in China, even during the period of the Southern and Northern Empires when China was torn by foreign invasions, civil wars and revolutions, the Japanese tributes came frequently and uninterruptedly. In 421 the ruler of Japan was given the title Great General (Ta Chiang Chün) by a Sung Emperor of the Southern Empire and in 504 he was promoted to the rank of Prince (Wang) by a Wei Emperor of the Northern Empire. From the Chinese Dynastic Histories we learn that in paying the regular tribute, Japan was required to present through its envoy a formal petition acknowledging the supremacy of the Chinese emperor. Twice during the Sung dynasty Japanese tribute was rejected and an imperial audience was denied to its envoy on account of the irregularities of this petition.

The international relations between China and Japan continued to be peaceful and harmonious until the Mongols conquered China. The Mongols were the most militaristic and imperialistic people of the Orient and their Kahns were ever longing for further conquest. Since Japan had been a tributary to the overthrown Chinese Sung dynasty and always friendly and sympathetic towards the Chinese people, she refused to pay homage to the new Mongol Yuan dynasty. In 1264 and in 1266 Kublai Kahn twice sent direct envoys to induce Japan to submit, and in 1267 and 1269 he ordered the Koreans to persuade the Japanese to follow their suit, but all in vain. In 1270 he dispatched once more an imperial commission which succeeded in bringing Japanese tribute-bearers for the following years. In 1275 Kublai declared war upon Japan for the first time. Despite the large fleet and the superior fire-arms commanded by Mongol and Chinese generals in three successive expeditions, Japan was not beaten and the Japanese tribute never came again to the Mongol court. This punitive measure of the Mongols and its failure altered the international situation between China and Japan.

When the Manchus established themselves in China, the Japanese first attempted a sympathetic aid to the Ming dynasty, but finally accepted the supremacy of the Ch'ing dynasty. They have, nevertheless, been less friendly and more suspicious towards the Manchus than they were towards the Chinese, and their tributes came to the court very irregularly. An equal position with, and an aggressive action against China was, however, not manifested until after the Great Reform of Japan in 1868.

In spite of the racial resemblance and cultural similarity between China and Japan, there is an outstanding diversity in the histories of the two countries. China has, as a rule, been governed by the civilians, while Japan from the beginning by its military caste; since 221 B. C., during the reign of the first Emperor of the Ch'in dynasty, China has been rid of the feudal system, while Japan lived in it until the fourth year of Meiji, 1871. One reason why, while China has changed many dynasties, Japan has remained under one and the same ruling house is simply because for centuries the so-called ruling house was merely a figure-head and its actual ruling power rested upon the Shogonate, which literally means inherited military dictatorship. This great diversity has shaped the two peoples in different dispositions and characteristics which in turn determined the histories of the two nations. The causes of this diversity are numerous and complicated. Geography might be its prime and fundamental one. It is nothing strange to find two peoples of the same origin developing along diverse lines, since brothers, sisters, and even twins often grow vastly apart. The Japanese government since the Great Reform, though having gone through many changes of political parties and military cliques, has maintained its definite policy at least in two points: First a wholesale and whole-hearted adaptation of western civilization with all its related materialism, industrialism, imperialism, etc.; and second, the expansion of Japan, territorially, politically and economically. Sometimes this policy has brought up strong reactions among the Japanese upon national and international issues, but, viewed as a whole, it has been a fixed policy throughout modern Japanese history. Both China and Japan are at present members of a world family. They are no more isolated but interdependent not only between themselves but also with all other nations. The world has become so small and sensitive that any change of international conditions between two members will certainly affect the whole.

The recollection by both countries of the fraternal if not filial relationship which subsists between them should make it possible for Japan and China to set about, in a spirit of amity, the reconciliation of their differences, so important to the peace of the world.

KIANG KANG-HU

THE CAT AS AN EMBLEM

[**M. Oldfield Howey** is the author of *The Encircled Serpent*, *The Horse in Magic and Myth*, and only last year published a fascinating volume on the subject of Cat on which he writes this article.—EDS.]

To the Theosophist the study of the esoteric interpretation of sacred and profane legends is not merely a fascinating pursuit, but a matter of paramount importance. Anciently every nation embodied its religious convictions and esoteric history in emblems and ideographs designed to hide the true meaning from the multitude and reveal it to the initiate. All the erudition and science, all the deeper emotions and philosophy of the older peoples found expression in allegory and fable, either pictured or written. Every known natural object was pressed into the service of the mystical and hierarchical language, and the higher domesticated animals because of their intelligence, strongly marked characteristics, and proximity, easily took a foremost place among the glyphs. Among them the cat stands forth with special prominence, and justly so, since we might travel far in search of an image that could better illustrate the definition of an emblem as given by Madame Blavatsky than our feline friend affords. For the cat is, and, since the dawn of history wherever she was domesticated, has ever been, "a concrete visible picture or sign representing principles, recognizable by those who have received certain instructions (Initiates)". Indeed, she is in herself "a series of graphic pictures," and when "viewed and explained allegorically" she unfolds an idea "in panoramic views, one after the other," until we are almost bewildered by their variety and rapidity of succession. They have been taken from no single standpoint, but seem to have been selected with an eye to the revelation of the innumerable facets of the intrically cut diamond of life, so that each "not only includes several interpretations, but also relates to several sciences". The greatest of all sciences—the Science of Religion—has freely employed the plastic emblem of the cat to reveal or re-veil her mysteries. This is especially true in the most ancient and widespread of all the many forms assumed by Religion : the worship of Sun and Moon. Heliolatry and Luniolatry have survived through endless vicissitudes from a remote and prehistoric past to the present day ; sometimes openly, but in other periods disguised by new titles and formula, which, as in the case of Christianity, enable them to arise with new life from the ashes of their dead or discarded tabernacles.

And always the inextricably entangled symbolism of the Solar and Lunar creeds found a common glyph in the cat, so that we are at no loss to account for the

extraordinary importance of her position in religious allegory.

The reason this animal was chosen for such honour was no arbitrary one, and its explanation becomes at once apparent if we pause a moment to consider the meaning of the name bestowed on Puss by the ancient Egyptians. For to them she was *Mau*, the Seer. They had admiringly observed that the Cat had the power to see, in what, to their human eyes, appeared as impenetrable darkness that rendered all invisible. They noted further how her eyes resembled the lunar planet in their waxing and waning, and that they shone like stars in the gloom of night, and grew more luminous as its shadows deepened. She was thus a "living pictograph of the lunar orb," the Celestial Seer of Night, and was regarded by the Egyptians as the earthly representative of their great goddess Isis, who was symbolised by the Moon. Because of this she was held in such veneration in the city of Bubastis—which was sacred to Isis in her character as Lunar Goddess —that its inhabitants were wont to assume deep mourning if one of the temple cats died. And the Cat was represented as seated on the apex of the mysterious Sistrum which Isis bore in her hand as the symbol of the world's harmony.

The Moon was the reflection of the solar orb, and thus was regarded as the Eye of Osiris, the personified Sun, during the Night. Gerald Massey is quoted by Madame Blavatsky as saying that "the cat saw the Sun, had it in its eye by night (was the eye of night), when it was otherwise unseen by men . . . We might say the moon *mirrored* the solar light, because we have *looking-glasses.* With them the cat's eye was the mirror".*

The Sun, because "he" saw in the darkness of the Underworld, was also thought of as a cat, and the Egyptian poet-priests depicted Isis, his sister and spouse, The Queen of Night, assuming the form of the Cat-headed goddess Pasht, that she might keep watch for her absent lord through the hours of gloom. And her office was no sinecure, for she had to struggle with his deadly enemy, Apep, the Dragon of Darkness, and hold him down with her darting paws of radiant light, until the Great Cat of the Sun could once again return and cut off the head of his foe, which because he was immortal, always grew on again. Thus she justified her titles of the Tearer and the Render, and proved that they were not incompatible with love.

Yet Isis, in common with all the lunar goddesses, had a dual aspect, one divine and the other infernal. And in both we find her imaged by the Cat. For to the ancient Egyptian, the Deity was All, and embraced the Darkness as well as the Light. The Cat, equally in harmony with Night and Day, yet further emphasized the doctrine that extremes meet, and All is One, by her habit of coiling her body into a circle for

* *The Secret Doctrine* II, 552, 553.

repose. Apropos of this, Madame Blavatsky quotes the Hermetic axiom *Deus enim et circulus est*, and adds that Pythagoras recommended a "circular prostration and posture during the hours of contemplation".

The association of the Cat with the sacred figure of the Circle would seem to be responsible for the popular saying that "a cat has nine lives". The superstition has a mathematical as well as an occult foundation when thus viewed, since the digits that represent any multiple of nine, if added together, always total nine, and thus complete a circle; so that, in Madame Blavatsky's phrase, Nine is "the sign of every circumference". As the Trinity of Trinities, Nine was anciently considered to be the most sacred of all digits, and the Egyptian idea that all divinities could be enumerated in nines was probably the reason why nine was dedicated to both Sun and Moon, even as it was to the Cat that represented them, by all the nations that had felt the influence of Egyptian thought.

It is also possible to see in the Nine Lives of the Cat the symbol of Reincarnation, for, as *The Secret Doctrine* points out, "the whole secret of life is in the unbroken series of its manifestations"; unbroken, even by bodily deaths, because they form an integral portion of the Circle of Eternity.

We are told by Herodotus that the Egyptians were the first teachers of the doctrine of transmigration, and some of their paintings show that they believed human souls which were found wanting when weighed in the scales before Osiris suffered an ignominious return to earth in the forms of cats and other animals. Pythagoras, who is said to have visited Egypt in his youth, and studied its mysterious religion, appears to have accepted this view, and taught that souls pass from the form of an animal to that of a human being, and back again. But a happier conception is placed before us in Theosophy which affirms that it is certainly not the fact that the human soul, which has once reached the level of humanity, ever incarnates again in the form of an animal. Pythagoras, later in his life, travelled to India, where he was received by the Brahmins, and, we read in *Isis Unveiled* (I. 290) that thereafter "the Pythagoreans grounded the principal tenets of their philosophy" on Buddhist doctrine. "'Can that spirit, which gives life and motion, and partakes of the nature of light, be reduced to nonentity?' they ask. 'Can that sensitive spirit in brutes which exercises memory, one of the rational faculties, die, and become nothing?'" To formulate the question is surely to answer it with an unhesitating negative.

M. OLDFIELD HOWEY

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

THE DRAMA OF LIFE*

LILA OF ISHVARA

[**Hugh I'A. Fausset's** articles often have an eastern flavour, and they invariably bring evidence of clear thinking, mystical apperception and an insight uncommon among western authors. He describes the book reviewed as "a guide to Vedanta".—EDS.]

A western student, approaching without expert guidance the vast province of literature which enshrines the native philosophy of India, may well feel that he is entering a jungle in which the original paths laid down by the myth-maker, sage and visionary are so obscured beneath the growths of generations of individual commentators, that the very meaning of the term 'Vedānta' as the 'End of the Vedas' seems an ironic jest.

That the term has in fact a deep significance Dr. Das reveals very clearly. The category of End, construed philosophically, does not mean the final stage of a process, but that finality of truth which is 'the informing spirit of the whole, distilled, as it were, into its successive phases'. It is the creative and dynamic principle which is operative throughout, and so 'the End in its interpretative function is as much operative at the very start or beginning as at the *de facto* end of anything,' although it is only in the last term that its nature is perfectly revealed. This conception of 'the End' is significant of the sustained creativeness of the 'Vedānta'. It is not a speculative system abstracted from life but a reasoned organism; it is not a collection of thoughts logically connected but a visionary symphony composed of rhythms in thinking. Its dialectic is integral to an imaginative appreciation of the whole. But while a western student may feel the truth of this, he may still remain oppressed and baffled by the exuberance and fecundity of this organic growth. Nor can he find much comfort in the fact that this growth has a historic necessity. It sprang in fact out of the very compactness and abbreviation of the *Sūtras*, which in the absence of printing facilities had to be extremely terse even at the risk of obscurity and ambiguity. And this weakness invited and found a remedy in the periodical infusion of new blood from commentaries and scholia. 'Thus embodied and vitalized,' as Dr. Das remarks, 'the *Sūtras* prove to be a tower of strength and fountainhead of inspiration for the commentaries with which they appear in constant conjunction'. Never-

* *Towards a Systematic Study of the Vedanta*. By Saroj Kumar Das. (University of Calcutta.)

theless the commentators are bewilderingly many and the inspired and true interpreter hard to find. Such a just and perceptive guide as Dr. Das is therefore of great value and the more so to western students because he is intimate with European philosophy and has adopted as far as possible its technique. Believing, too, that a philosophical study worth the name, must be either comparative or nothing, he has drawn frequent and illuminating comparisons between the Vedānta and such western philosophers as Plato, Kant, Hegel, Hume, Bradley and Russell. And above all he has significantly limited the scope of the Vedānta itself. Refusing to include within it, as some would, 'every blessed commentary and annotation, manual or monograph on the main findings of the Vedānta,' he has taken the *Upanishads*, the *Bhagavad-Gita*, and the *Brahmasūtras* as constituting its canon, and the teaching of Saṁkara-Vedānta as at once the profoundest and most classically balanced interpretation of it. This does not prevent him from referring to earlier conceptual formulations of some of the main problems of the Vedānta or to some of Saṁkara's philosophic successors but not only the truth and the essence of Vedānta philosophy but 'the true ideal of philosophy, which is not, so much knowledge as wisdom, not so much logical reasoning as spiritual freedom' is contained for him in the teaching of Saṁkara.

To attempt in a short review any summary of an exposition so vast in its reference and yet so detailed and subtle in its analysis would obviously be impossible. It is enough to say that although Dr. Das's style is occasionally perhaps unduly involved and laboured, we could not wish for a more clarifying or enlightening guide from the valleys of the *Ṛgveda*, in which 'the Many' predominates over 'the One'; to the ultimate heights of the *Upanishads* where 'the One,' exists eternally, unconditioned by 'the Many'.

The relation of the One to the Many has always been of course the central problem of philosophy. And since the chief criticism of the Vedānta by Western thinkers has been that it unduly drives the Many in its exaltation of the One, Dr. Das's account of Saṁkara's conception of Brahman is of particular interest and takes us also inevitably into the very heart of his metaphysics. In the *Māṇḍukya Upanishad* it is written of the fourth grade of reality that it is "unseen, transcendent, inapprehensible, uninferrable, unthinkable, indescribable, the sole essence of the consciousness of Self, the negation of the world, the ever-peaceful, all-blissful, the one unitary principle—this indeed is the *Atman*".

Such a statement is well calculated to excite opposition in the positive Westerner. He will, as Dr. Das remarks, pounce upon it and exclaim,—" here lies exactly the danger-zone of the *via negativa*; herein is to be found a

capital illustration of a vicious abstractionism which has, with perfect logical consistency, represented Brahman, the supposed spiritual principle of unity, as an abstract colourless unity sublimated beyond the zero-point of existence, and consequently as a 'bundle of negations,' a veritable 'lion's den' that wipes out all trace of particularity". The danger, indeed, exists. Nor does Dr. Das deny it. But it is a danger which has to be faced and surpassed if life equally in its absolute reality and in its relative manifestations is to be truly conceived. "The 'Everlasting Nay' of a spiritual quest," to quote Dr. Das, "must needs be pressed to its furthest limits in order that the 'Everlasting Yea' of a blessed life can be attained. And the abiding importance and peculiar excellence of Saṁkara-Vedānta both as a philosophic system and a source of spiritual enlightenment is that it does equal justice to the absolute and to the relative, that it at once grounds all the values of life, theoretical or practical, in one consummate value, and presents them in a graded hierarchy terminating in the Supreme. Saṁkara seems, indeed, to have been pre-eminent as a philosopher in his ability to do equal justice to the claims of Rationalism and Revelation, Individuality and Selflessness. He exalted neither at the expense of the other, but achieved such a wonderful blend and balance of the two as is without an historical parallel in the whole range of Indian philosophy—with approximations to it only in the systems of Thomas Aquinas or Abelard in the West".

That at least is Dr. Das's claim and he certainly substantiates it very convincingly. The comparison with Aquinas is particularly interesting in view of the Neo-Thomists of to-day who are commending the system of this greatest of medieval thinkers as the true corrective of the vicious rationalism from which western philosophy and western life are suffering. It is possible indeed to argue that Aquinas was the last European philosopher to satisfy justly the claims of reason and revelation and to prove them complementary. But unlike Saṁkara he did not quite transcend the anthropomorphism of a devout Catholic. And it is for that reason more than any other perhaps that the very impressive synthesis which he constructed fails to satisfy the needs of to-day. Saṁkara on the other hand transcended anthropomorphism by that very insistence upon the absolute incomprehensibility of Brahman which excites the Westerner's suspicion. But the suspicion is not justified in the case of Saṁkara-Vedānta. For while Saṁkara, as a staunch Absolutist, enthroned over his system the Spirit eternally unconditioned and pure, self-sufficient and perfect, towards which the only possible human attitude was one of ultimate agnosticism, he supplemented this conception of Brahman by his interpretations of Iśvara as Creator

and of Līlā as Creation. Why the Absolute should ever have lapsed from the perfection of its own integral experience and, in the words of William James, 'refracted itself into all our finite experiences,' is a question which no philosopher has ever been able to answer. And Saṁkara does not answer it except by asserting that it is a question which should not be asked. What he does however is to refuse resolutely to limit the infinite and ineffable reality of Brahman by any finite categories of human purpose or desire, but at the same time to introduce him as Iśvara into the natural and the moral order. To some this may seem rather an evasion than a solution of the problem. Why, they may ask, will not Iśvara suffice? But the answer is to be found in the history of every merely naturalistic philosophy, however inspired. Unless the unconditioned reality of Brahman is preserved whether as an incomprehensible mystery or as an absolute truth vouched for by the beatific experience of the mystics, Iśvara inevitably becomes not merely conditioned by, but submerged in the natural order. And the unique value of Saṁkara's system is that it equally avoids that separation of the Divine from the natural which is the vice of orthodox theology and that subordination of the Divine to the human which is the defect of intellectualism and humanism.

It is because Saṁkara as an absolutist held so firmly to the *via negativa* that his interpretation of Iśvara, the spiritual principle of unity as it manifests itself through *Māyā*, is so positively true. It was this which saved him from reducing the Creative Spirit either to a moral legislator or a sublimated logician, the mistake of the theologian and the intellectual, or to a mere synthesis of natural forces, the mistake of the materialist. Iśvara creates at once "out of the abundance of his joy and for the fulfilment of the demands of morality". There is in him no conflict between the moral impulse and the expressive.

It is this creative spontaneity, which is moral because of the purity of its creativeness, which Saṁkara defined in the comprehensive category of *Līlā*. And here again he insisted that the notion of *Līlā* must be purged of the last vestige of a false anthropomorphism before it could truly represent divine creativity. He conceded God's activity even in the realm of *Māyā* as pure self-expression, in the sense that it was not constrained or determined by any conscious purpose. It was a Divine 'Play' which realised itself from its very nature without subserving some other end. Dr. Das comments very helpfully upon Saṁkara's use of the word 'Play' to explain the principle of creation. But he neglects to cite the example of art. The supreme moments of artistic creation afford, perhaps, the closest human analogy to what Saṁkara meant by the Divine 'Play'. For these, too, are moments of a pure self-expression, which transcends altogether the category of conscious will or purpose, but which is at the same time rationally determined from within. And the unique significance of Saṁkara's conception of creation lay in the fact that he viewed Iśvara as a supreme artist, constrained in his cosmic play by no such purpose or end as the self-conscious human mind pursues, but realising in himself, with a perfect and inevitable spontaneity the purposiveness, rationality, ease and effortlessness with which the creation is sustained. And this conception of the Creator governed and corresponded with his conception of the inspired self-sufficiency of the primary or real Self. "Verily," he wrote, "that being which is not dependent or conditional on some other being, is the very essence or individuality of a being. What is, however, dependent on an Other is not the essence or individuality—for the simple reason of its extinction on the disappearance of that Other".

The comprehensive truth of Saṁkara's teaching is perhaps most clearly revealed in the manner in which he reconciled the principles of individuality and universality, avoiding alike the false and prejudiced limitations of the personal and the 'vast inane' of an abstract and colourless impersonal. He recognised equally the infinite variety of expression possible to a true self-hood and its underlying inaccessibility and conformity to an eternal and rhythmic pattern.

The spirit inspiring and informing the Vedānta, as Saṁkara reveals it, is, in short, the spirit of the whole, a spirit by which justice is done to each aspect of the world according to its proper rank and all are drawn into a vital and necessary union. Saṁkara's system is described as 'Non-dualism,' and the name is important as distinguishing it from a system of abstract or absolute monism. Western Philosophy since the time of Aquinas has been stricken with the disease of dualism, even as western life has been. It has lost the secret of the whole. And this is true even of such professed idealists and monists as Hegel, while the efforts of the great Kant to throw a bridge across the gulf that had opened in human experience or of Bradley in our own day failed to the extent that an excessive intellectualism prevented them from realizing fully the spiritual principle of Unity in themselves. In the materialists, the vitalists, the pragmatists, the neo-realists, or emergent evolutionists, the one-sidedness is too apparent to need emphasising. But Dr. Das often exposes it very cogently in passing and his criticism of Bertrand Russell's "free man's worship" and "gospel of unyielding despair" is both entertaining and unanswerable. The lasting virtue of Saṁkara-Vedānta is that it is free equally from anti-intellectualism and intellectualism, that its dialectic is always put to the service of an integral experience, and logical values subordinated to Spiritual intuition. It maintains the integrity and identity of Being through all the modes of its manifestation. Western philo-

sophy has become partial and disproportioned because it has lost this integrity. And such a study of the Vedānta as this is particularly valuable in an age when 'the Many' have so multiplied in human consciousness that the co-ordinating Spirit of 'the One' is almost obscured.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CONSCIOUSNESS*

[**J. D. Beresford** shows how the trend of modern thought is towards the invisible and the spiritual in a very able criticism of three volumes recently published.—EDS.]

Regarded from one point of view, these three books represent the typical succession of (1) observation, followed by logical deduction; (2) introspection, with an increase of self-awareness; and (3) that recognition of a unity throughout matter, time and space which is the essential of mystical experience. But although this may be a normal succession over a protracted period, figuring for us the outline of a process by which a cycle of human development rises from the sensory life through an increase of self-consciousness to a recognition of the informing spirit; if we take a kind of cross-section through a given moment, more especially in the later years of the cycle, we shall find evidence of the three stages existing contemporaneously.

It is, for instance, typical of the present period to find a writer such as Mr. Verschoyle, primarily an engineer and mathematician, pushing the observational and deductive method to the point at which what we commonly know as matter appears as no more than a temporary illusion, passing as he suggests "from material into immaterial existence". The astonishing development of physics in the past sixty years,—if we may date its beginning from Clerk Maxwell's work on Electricity and Magnetism,—has led inevitably to this result, even if the conclusion is not yet accepted by the majority of Scientists. The investigation of the structure of matter by observation and experiment, as far as that was possible, aided by the powerful and accurate instrument of mathematics, has led on the material plane to deductions that must presently accord with the intuitive wisdom of the adept and the mystic. Sir James Jeans emerges with the concept of a mathematical God, Sir Arthur Eddington with the postulation that the ultimate reality

* *The Soul of an Atom* by W. Denham Verschoyle. (The Search Publishing Co., London. *7s. 6d.*)
The Use of the Self by F. Matthias Alexander. (Methuen. London, *6s.*)
Song and Its Fountains by A. E. (Macmillan, London. *5s.*)

is consciousness, and now Mr. Verschoyle in his final summary suggests, in a reasonably near approximation to what we regard as truth, that "the Spirit of Life and Intelligence is in all things," and that "whilst self-moulding its parts, both great and small, to a fundamental pattern, it takes on itself, as a whole, a transient individuality, a macro-cosmic semblance of that particle wherein is first plainly discerned the determinative working of the Life principle".

How, in this instance, Mr. Verschoyle arrives at that conclusion is not of great importance in this place. The gist of the matter is found on the physicist's experience that however deeply he may push his inductions into structure, the ultimate particle he seeks, the unit of matter from which he might imaginatively rebuild the phenomenal world, still escapes his tests and eludes his mathematical theories. There is, in fact, a clear limitation to the methods of science, a limitation admitted by the Scientists themselves,—and so far as mathematical physics is concerned, it seems extremely probable that in the course of the next few years this limit may be so clearly defined as to determine further research in this direction. When that point is reached, however, the long and arduous work of the investigators who have been engaged in this research will have found sufficient justification by affording a body of material proof for the assertion that matter is an illusion of humanity's present condition.

The Use of the Self as expounded by Mr. Alexander is in the first place therapeutical. He has been engaged for a great many years in the practice of certain curative methods with results that have been acclaimed even by members of that conservative profession with which he has been frequently in competition. But what is of particular interest to readers of THE ARYAN PATH in this relation, is the underlying theory upon which Mr. Alexander has founded his methods. Quite early in his career, he became convinced that many, perhaps most, disabilities of civilised man were brought about not by any original fault or malformation of *the* organism, but by acquired mental and physical habits arising from a misconception of the uses of the body; and his first efforts were directed to a re-education of the patient's attitude towards his own bodily mechanisms. The technique that he developed for this purpose does not concern us here. What is of importance are his assumptions, put to the pragmatic test by the cures he has worked, as to the psychical and mental re-actions of the representative human being.

In so far as he has posited a subconsciousness, his work has been parallel in many respects to psycho-analysis, and resembles it to the extent that his efforts are mainly directed to raising the awareness of the control of bodily acts, including such semi-automatic functions as breathing, into

full consciousness. His technique, however, is completely different, as his method of "re-education" does not attempt to dissociate the psychic or mental personality from the physical in the familiar manner of analysis, but continually relates the patients' thought to the performance of the physical act as ideally conceived for the proper fulfilment of its purpose,—at which point Mr. Alexander's object is served. He does not, for instance, try to develop the Ouspenskian double-consciousness, which is, also, induced in the first stages of training by cultivating a fuller awareness of the bodily mechanism.

Mr. Alexander's present book, like the two earlier ones that have preceded it, are confined almost exclusively to our mental make-up in relation to physical function. But if we accept his conclusions in this connection, as we can hardly refuse to do, it is obvious that we may apply them to the misapprehension common to other associations of spirit and body. He writes, for example :—

> The belief is very generally held that if only we are told what to do in order to correct a wrong way of doing something, we can do it, and that if we *feel* we are doing it all is well. All my experience, however, goes to show that this belief is a delusion.

This is an illuminating version of the automatism of the average man and woman. We form a conviction whether as in this case of a sensory reaction, or, in an intellectual relation, of the correctness of our reasoning in any particular. But neither the physical re-action nor the mental conviction represent anything more than an effort to obtain personal satisfaction or has any true validity apart from this particular application. We live in a self-created world of delusion, and there are few who are able to look beyond or, indeed, even to realise it.

Nevertheless with our third book we come to the experience of one who by the natural gift of his spiritual development has been in touch with the aboslute. Mr. George Russell ("A.E.") was born with mystical powers. He is not to be counted with those who have acquired them by stern self-discipline and continual exercise of the will to freedom. And it may be that he will have to reap a measure of suffering in his next incarnation, as a consequence of his failure to make the fuller progress that was possible for him. He should not, for instance, have had to confess as he does here that his gift has waned with the years, that "the walls about the psyche have thickened with age and there are many heavinesses piled about it". Very early he tells us he had a "vivid sense of a being seeking incarnation . . . no angelic thing, pure and new from a foundry of souls, which sought embodiment, but a being stained with the dust and conflict of a long travel through time, carrying with it unsated desires, base and august . . . . myriads of memories and a secret wisdom". Nor need we doubt that this sense of his corresponded to an absolute reality.

But we must believe that one blessed in his early years with this intuitive vision of truth has the greater responsibility to the world and to himself. It is true that by all common standards he has lived worthily. "We run to A.E., in time of need and never run in vain," George Moore wrote of him in "Vale"; and A.E. himself who is certainly free from any handicap of spiritual pride, demonstrated his clear-sighted knowledge of himself when he repudiated George Moore's portrait of him by asking: "Why have you found no fault with me? If you wish to create human beings you must discover their faults." Is it not possible, however, that the fault, which would inevitably escape George Moore, is A.E's failure so to cultivate his priceless gift that it should increase throughout life, in which case surely he would never have had to confess that "the walls about the psyche have thickened with age"?

The answer to that question is beyond our knowledge, but it is permissible to pose it before we acclaim the quality of the vision that in this case has weakened when it might have grown in range and intensity. For there can be no question that George Russell is a true seer and even in this little book of 133 small pages, there is evidence enough that his vision accords, as all true impersonal visions must accord, with the truths of the Ancient Wisdom. He is familiar with the Upanishads, but he probably went to them in the first instance for the refreshment of his own intuitions rather than for discovery. Thus in the quotation from those books of the Ancient Wisdom given here concerning "the higher transfiguration of the psyche beyond the mid-world of dream," we feel in reading that the reference is modestly given as an authority for that which was initially the writer's independent conception. And A.E's deductions in this connection are worth quoting. He writes:—

> The words of the seer imply that there came up to that high world images of the Earth-world, chariots to his Lands, joys and rejoicings; and, taking images and ideas, the god-lit psyche makes its magical play as a great poet transfiguring the things his eyes have seen and making of them a wonder-world of his own, of magic casements, perilous seas and forlorn fairy-lands. Here, too, the soul being immortal, would bring memories of its journeyings from the beginning of time, of religions and civilisations which are all built about some divine idea, some hope of liberty, power or beauty breathed into men from the divinity which overshadows them.

Thus far that state "beyond the mid-world of dream" may be visited intermittently by the greatest poets such as he who is implicitly referred to. But Keats' inspiration from that high source is of a different quality from that of George Russell's, inasmuch as Keats' memories on his return were not related to the fountain from which they were drawn. With A.E. the place of vision is more definitely recognised and therefore upon him lies the greater burden of responsibility. Nor is

he, nor could he possibly be, unaware of it. What, he asks, are the labours of the soul returning by the way it came from those high spheres; and his answer bears the impress of the immortal truths he has learned. "The soul," he tells us, "has to make the conquest of this world, become master of the nature which envelops us, until the eternal is conscious in us, and we have made this world into a likeness or harmony with the Kingdom of Light".

Now that is a mandate which, if it be disobeyed by those who have received it, carries the threat of future penalty. For the ignorant, the retributions of Karma are comparatively light. The road must be learnt and each failure necessitates a renewal of the lesson. If we cannot learn in ease, then we must learn in pain. But the pain is of another order from that suffered by those who have recognised the truth and failed to make advance towards that ideal state in which "the eternal is conscious in us".

J. D. BERESFORD

What Dare I Think? By JULIAN HUXLEY. (Chatto and Windus. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

Music at Night. By ALDOUS HUXLEY (Chatto and Windus, London. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

Julian and Aldous Huxley are typical pioneers in the modern world of intellectual endeavour. Julian has acquired fame as a biologist, Aldous as writer: both are in the van of modern thinkers, scientific in method but not averse from mystical ideas. What they write, stimulates and yet brings with it a sense of futility and underlying sadness. One asks again and again:—Why, with all this searching, do not they and the seeking crowds they represent probe deeper into the mysticism they so evidently respect? There at least they might find the satisfaction that has so far escaped them. They do wrong to be suspicious of the East.

The latest theories of the Huxleys and their newest queries are embodied in twin volumes of popular essays very recently published—*What Dare I Think?* by Professor Julian, and *Music At Night* by Mr. Aldous. The former, more amusing in conversation, is deeply serious when he writes; the latter, more often grave than gay, fills his books with apparent flippancy and cynicism.

Professor Julian calls his essays a "challenge of science to human action and belief". He is very free with his criticism of superstition and false traditions. Evidently he agrees with Bernard Shaw that "the world is like a garden—it needs weeding as well as sowing". Here, the weeding is done with zest. What the professor particularly dislikes, is the hypocrisy and the arrogant self-righteousness of supporters of the old regime. In his *Africa View* he put into words the violent indignation he now develops. He said then, speaking of certain Christian missionaries:—

> I wonder if people of this stamp realize that their ideas seem exactly as barbaric, crude, and wrong to a considerable and influential section of civilized people as do to them the ideas of the primitive tribes among whom they are working. Do they at all grasp that there exists a large and growing body of men and women, brought up in the new conception of the universe which science is revealing, familiarized with modern ideas on religion, who find religion a way of life, an attitude of mind, not a body of dogma or a system of salvation, and who believe that religion can only live if it abandons its primitive certitude and learns to change and grow—and that to them the theology which was orthodox up to the late nineteenth century is completely obsolete, as obsolete as feudalism, bows and arrows, or the divine right of kings? I will quote one instance of what I mean. The following extract from a letter was in a copy of *Ruanda Notes*, a Central African missionary journal, which I happened to see. The pious gentleman is describing some of the horrors of a famine. "As I walked down the hill from the hospital my blood boiled because of the cruelty of it all, but the answer came to me. Sin was written across these withered bodies. Satan had dragged them down, and given death and disease as his reward." This is white enlightenment and Christian charity!

The cure for this old-fashioned hypocrisy is an honest stock-taking in our new position:—

> One of the most obvious of the effects of science has been to confer upon man enormously enhanced power in dealing with the universe around him, and to hold out the prospect of a steady increase in this power. But at the same time, it has robbed him of his proud conviction of being the hero of the cosmic play, has deposed him from his seat in the centre of the universe, and relegated him to the position of an insignificant parasite produced by one of the satellites of one of the millions of stars in one of the millions of galaxies. [p. 122.]

A deep humility becomes this realisation. With it, however, we need not adopt the rejection of all religion which characterized the followers of old Thomas Huxley in the last century. The modern attitude is different. Here is what Julian Huxley says:—

> By showing the baselessness of traditional theologies, science seemed at one time to be giving religion itself a mortal blow. But, when we come to look deeper, we find the unescapable fact of religious experience, which no scientific analysis can remove. Thus, by forcing religious thought to distinguish between theological scaffolding and religious core, science has actually encouraged the growth of a truer and more purely religious spirit. To put it in another way, if science has robbed religion of many of its certitudes, those certitudes were in a sphere improper to religion. True religious certitude is not in the realm of intellect at all, but concerns values and a special attitude towards them. Science has evicted religion from the universal but uneasy throne she occupied in the Middle Ages, but she has helped her to ascend her true and permanent throne of spiritual experience. After overthrowing supernaturalism, science is confronted with humanism. [pp. 122-123.]

It is in taking the next step that the moderns seem to fail. They are aware now that science cannot be the all-in-all of life. They see, too, the danger of science going on alone, in opposition to the religious spirit:—

> The dangers of the opposition between science and humanism are many and obvious. The chief and central one is that scientific and humanist thought, failing to comprehend or sympathise with one another, shall organize themselves into two separate or even antagonistic streams, so that civilization shall be two-minded, in large part divided against itself, instead of single-minded, with a common main purpose and idea underlying all variety of minor difference. [p. 138.]

But when it comes to defining the line of progress to be taken by this humanism, this natural religion, Professor Huxley is at a loss. We cannot help thinking that a careful study of Eastern scientific systems for religious development would help him to solve his dilemma. He will have nothing of revelation or tradition, but he feels the Inner Life, and yearns, as he himself quotes, "to have life, and have it more abundantly". . . . "life, however complex, is essentially one" . . . "Humanity is an experiment of the universe in rational self-consciousness." This unity and consciousness of this unity are to be approached in one way by human beings—the way discovered by Professor Huxley's counterparts in the ancient scientific schools of the East. To them, religion was no worship of anthropomorphic deities, no bowing to tradition, but meditation, yoga, reasoning work. Body and mind were submitted to a scientific training, leading to higher grades of consciousness and into touch with Values and Ideas.

In the early part of his book Professor Huxley emphasizes the vast power being slowly accumulated for us by science, and proves, with some amazing examples from biology, the danger of interfering with the balance of Nature. He is fully aware of the fearful results to mankind from scientific power unchecked by moral force. He makes a statement, even, that would have profoundly shocked the scientific friends of his grandfather. He says—

> Any one, who has experienced the illumination of new knowledge, or the ecstasy of poetry or music, or the deliberate subordination of self to something greater, or the self-abandonment of falling in love, or complete physical well-being, or the intense satisfaction of a difficult task achieved, or has had a mystical experience, knows that they are in some way valuable for their own sakes beyond ordinary every-day satisfactions, such as being more or less fit, earning one's own living, or

filling one's belly . . . . . There is value in logical thought; so there is in mystical experience. [pp. 162, 167.]

Again, Professor Huxley insists that:–

There is, in fact, a reserve of the angelic in ordinary people, which is unused and even unsuspected, because it does not fit with everyday ideas, because, in fact, we, most of us, are subconsciously rather apologetic about such impractical and inconvenient idealisms. Is there a way of tapping this reserve of moral power without letting it loose in the form of irrational prejudice or wild fanaticism, moral, religious, or patriotic? [pp. 173, 174.]

He says that he, personally, does not know; and adds that "We build laboratories to test out how we can harness and concentrate electrical and chemical and mechanical forces; but the corresponding problem of harnessing and intensifying the latent powers and activities of human nature we have scarcely even begun to envisage".

We repeat that it is, to say the least of it, unfortunate that the professor, so learned in many things, has taken no trouble to study the Eastern contributions to his subject. He might then have found it to be true that Light comes from the East. It is, after all, the main glory of Eastern thinkers to have achieved the very science these Huxleys desire. For that, they have neglected much of importance on outer planes, and their treasure has become surrounded with a forest of neglect through which Western eyes seldom take the trouble to pierce. It is here that lies the value of a book like this by Professor Huxley. He clears a road to the East hitherto barred by Western tradition, and makes ready the way for a new dispensation. The challenge is to us who support with our faith the ancient schools of esoteric wisdom. "Here are the facts," cries the scientist—"here is our lack! What will you do for us?" At least we may try to take advantage of the readiness of present-day students to learn our mystic creeds. The last chapter of *What Dare I Think?* shows that, for scientists, they come a prodigious part of the way to meet us.

Mr. Aldous Huxley is getting restive. He wants much the same spiritual satisfaction as his brother. His need becomes more and more apparent under the thin coating of cynical veneer he gives to his work. His great following is not only due to the amusement caused by his often bitter wit; it is due to the fact that his readers sense in his work the same craving for reality that tortures themselves: and the hope that his brilliance may find them a way out.

The modern epidemic of scepticism has begun to sicken Mr. Aldous.

There is, I believe, a general increase in scepticism with regard to most of the hitherto accepted ideas, particularly in the sphere of ethics. . . . . In its extreme forms, however, scepticism is, for most human beings, intolerable. They must believe in something; they must have some sort of justificatory ideas. [pp. 115-116.]

The trouble is, that the average man is untrained in the art of access to the power in his soul. His mental and spiritual apparatus has never developed the proper muscles. It is too weak to tackle concentration and constructive thought. Scepticism and frivolity are the line of least resistance. Wherefore, to quote Mr. Huxley, "we like insignificances and trivialities—prefer them (bottomlessly frivolous as we are) to the significant things which demand to be taken seriously, to be judged and thought about".

At last, in despair, Mr. Huxley exclaims:—

If I were a millionaire, I should endow a band of research workers to look for the ideal intoxicant. If we could sniff or swallow something that would, for five or six hours each day, abolish our solitude as individuals, atone us with our fellows in a glowing exaltation of affection and make life in all its aspects seem not only worth living, but divinely beautiful and significant, and if this heavenly, world-transfiguring drug were of such a kind that we could wake up next morning with a clear head and an undamaged constitution—then, it seems to me, all our problems would be wholly solved and earth would become paradise. [pp. 254-255.]

There is such a drug. Why not come to the mystics and get it?

R. A. L. M. ARMSTRONG

The Earlier Religion of Greece in the Light of Cretan Discoveries. By SIR ARTHUR EVANS. Frazer Lecture for 1931 in the University of Cambridge. (Macmillan & Co., Limited, London.)

Sir Arthur Evans is one of our greatest archæologists. It was his pioneer work in the excavation of Knossos and other sites in Crete that revealed to the world the story of the great Minoan civilisation, of which, except for a few vague legends preserved in Greek literature, every vestige had been forgotten. For thousands of years Crete was the headquarters of a highly evolved culture which spread outwards over the Ægean islands and continental Greece, where Mycenæ seems to have been its chief centre. Prior to the discoveries in Crete, the background of the classical age in the Mediterranean lands was dim and shadowy. There were the poems of Homer and Hesiod, who themselves belonged to the age of legend, with their famous tales of gods, demi-gods and heroes, in which history, romantic fiction and religious symbolism are inextricably blended. Apart from these, we might conjecture much, but we knew nothing.

But the spades of Sir Arthur and his colleagues have pierced through the curtain of myth that veiled everything beyond about 1,000 B. C., and have disclosed, not the primitive barbarism, so dear to the anthropologists of a past generation, but a civilisation comparable in age, enlightenment, and technical skill with those of Egypt, India, and Mesopotamia.

In the lecture under review, Sir Arthur describes the religion of Minoan times, as revealed by the pictures, statues, and sacred sites which have been unearthed in Crete and elsewhere. The beliefs and customs, thus disclosed, are shown to have remarkable affinities with those of later times. Both the exoteric religion of historic Greece and the cults of Western Asia seem to have branched off from the common Minoan stem, although in the classical age they had become widely differentiated.

The central object of Minoan worship was a Great Mother Goddess with her divine Son—prototypes of Cybele and Attis, Aphrodite and Adonis, Diana and Virbius; but in these later and degenerate cults, the son had become a lover, and unclean rites had been introduced which there is reason to believe were unknown in the Minoan age. In this connection it is a note-worthy fact that, as Sir Arthur tells us, "from the beginning to the end of Minoan Art, amongst all its manifold relics—from its earliest to its latest phase—not one single example had been brought to light of any subject of an indecorous nature".

Christianity too seems to have certain affiliations with the old Minoan worship. Thus a scene, almost exactly paralleling the "adoration of the magi" is found depicted on a signet ring, which shows the mother seated with her babe, in a cave, and receiving offerings from two warriors. The traditional arrangement of a Christian church was prefigured in the building known as the High Priest's Chapel at Knossos, with its choir-stalls, double chancel, and metal gates shutting off an inner sanctuary wherein stood an altar.

Sir Arthur is of opinion that the Minoan religion had "a more spiritual essence" than that of classical Greece: he finds in it "a certain moral ingredient —taken over, it may be, from Ancient Egypt—perceptible in the idea of the weighing of the Soul in butterfly form,... ...and by the scene on the 'Ring of Nestor' where the deceased are led before the Griffin Inquisitor, enthroned before the Goddess".

H.P. Blavatsky told us that there are seven keys to the interpretation of every symbol; and there is much work still to be done in the study of the religious symbolism of the ancient Cretans. On their engraved signet rings, of which Sir Arthur gives us several illustrations, appear frequently the butterfly and chrysalis, the upright stone associated with a sacred tree, the mother and child, the serpent, griffin-headed women, and other significant forms.

R. A. V. M.

Satyākāmā. By S. E. STOKES. (S. Ganesan & Co., Madras.)

S. E. Stokes was heard of as the champion of certain tribes on the Simla hills, and as an active participator in the Non-Co-operation movement of 1921–22. In this book *Satyākāmā*, he appears in the rôle of an original thinker. It was first sketched in prison in 1921–22 and was addressed to his wife as an explanation of his attitude to life. The personal form is retained on the advice of C. F. Andrews.

Satyākāmā is an attempt at a resolute working out of the implications of the vision that the Ultimate is love. The mahāvākya or great saying of St. John that God is Love furnishes the motive force, and Indian Philosophy, the framework of the metaphysic, which our author develops as the philosophy of Satyākāmā or True Desires.

Paramatman, Purusha and Prakriti constitute the three categories of Being, which in their unity are Brahman. Brahman is no separate category nor is it more ultimate than Paramatman. Brahman is simply Paramatman, Purusha and Parkriti seen in their integral unity. But Stokes's Paramatman is the Personal Brahman of Ramanuja and the God of Christian devotion, in so far as personality is concerned. He is the immanent and sustaining spirit. Stokes finds the *nisus* of creativity in the 'Need of Love to be Needed'. This according to him is no imperfection. This is the significance he finds in the Upanishadic passages "He desired: 'Would that I were many'," etc. Purusha in Stokes's metaphysic is the infinite potentiality of all conscious personality in the universe, called forth by Paramatman to respond to his Love. This Sankhya term is used by Stokes in his own way. It has no Sankhya meaning whatever in this book. Apparently it is chosen for its suggestion of personality. Stokes gives a picture of biological evolution and reads it as the process of vehicle-making for the development of Purusha. Purusha is unconscious potentiality in essence but develops *pari passu* with organic or vehicular evolution into centres of conscious individual personality. Purusha is one, though it manifests itself in myriads of organic forms. Further, Prakriti is the medium and instrument of manifestation for Purusha. It is not 'matter' in the scientist's sense. Stokes substantially adopts Ramanuja's view of prakriti. It is a non-sentient element necessary for life. The human organism is just one among the many vehicles that Purusha has built up in the course of evolution in association with Prakriti. Purusha and Prakriti evolve in close association, Prakriti predominating in the earlier stages. Stokes accepts the view that Buddhi belongs to Prakriti. The intellect is merely a part of the mechanism by which experiences are 'formulated' to the Purusha. The urge that accounts for the potentiality which is Purusha passing into the actuality of evolution is Paramatman's will (sankalpa). Stokes distinguishes his Purusha from the Jiva of Ramanuja. In the view of our author Purusha is not personal to begin with, but achieves personality in the course of evolution. The first stage is the achievement of Ahankara, or sense of clear-cut individuality. The second is that of transcending this Ahankara in the multi-personal unity of Purusha. *The* self must be built up before it can be offered. The emergence of Love in the Purusha evolution marks its hold on 'Eternal Life' and guarantees the individual from disruption. Immortality is to be achieved. Salvation is unity in Love with God and all the forms of purusha. Transmigration is accepted in a carefully defined sense. All the achievements of purusha in each centre are retained in the form of forgotten modifications in the texture of personality, and form the basis of further evolution. But memory is necessary in the higher reaches of experience. Immortality begins here and now when the individual has entered into experiences of permanent value such as love. Death does not affect us after such entry, and our love may ensure the immortality of those with whom we are indissolubly bound up.

The 'Avataras' are interpreted as 'Purushottamas' or great personalities who have far transcended us on the road of evolution. Thus Christ and Krishna are not GOD, neither are they men, but Purusha at a far higher level of development. The authority of Scriptures is interpreted as lying in their power to evoke deep experiences, and to afford illuminating clues to the great problems of existence. Stokes believes that Sankara's interpretation of 'Tat twam Asi' and 'Aham Brahma asmi' was not meant to deny finite individuation altogether, but only to contradict the nihilistic and dualistic tendencies of Buddhism and of Sankhya. What is to be annulled is not individuality but the illusion of separateness. Hence Stokes locates the source of individuation in the Purusha itself and not in the prakritic Upadhi. On the whole, the philosophy of Satyākāmā is an original variant of Personal Idealism, and recalls Lotze, Pringle-Pattison, Royce and Howison in the West and the Ramanuja type of Vaishnavism in India.

But his claim that it is a complete philosophy because it deals with Reality as a whole cannot be accepted. A system of philosophy demands a more detailed analysis of problems. The vision of Stokes must develop into a coherent account of all spheres of life. However the book is full of suggestive ideas and is written in a style of remarkable clarity rising frequently into moving eloquence.

M. A. VENKATA RAO

Mencius. A translation of a Chinese Philosopher's Writings with an Introduction by LEONARD A. LYALL. (Longmans, Green & Co. 12*s*. 6*d*.)

This new translation is opportune, for amidst universal unrest there is desire for Unity. When Mencius lived (*circa* 300 B.C.) local feuds threatened to destroy Chinese national unity. Confucius (*circa* 500 B.C.) had already tried to correct errors of government, but his influence was waning. Mencius sought to re-establish the ancient doctrines. Recalling how they had been exemplified by the emperors Yao, Shun and Yü, and King Wen and his sons, he proclaimed: "When rulers love their lieges, when they pity the unfortunate, then all below heaven can be ruled as if carried in the palm of the hand." He affirmed that goodness is fundamentally inherent in everyone,—like original good seed implanted, that may or may not be cherished. He fearlessly uttered soul-searching words, or with quick wit emphasised the point of the argument. But, like Confucius, he felt rebuffed, for the feudal princes, lacking courage, failed to follow his advice.

Certain key-words in Chinese Classics occur originally in the *Yih King*. Evidently the disciples of the Sages did not possess sufficient insight to appreciate their cosmic and microcosmic signification. The English words whereby some of the ideographic key-words are usually translated are not altogether satisfactory: e. g. *mind* for *te*, *gentleman* for *chün tzu*, *knight* for *shih*. But better renderings would not greatly affect the tenor of this translation, because the writings offer endless food for thought, whether or not their depth be plumbed. The inestimable worth of the book is enhanced by the indices. The frontispiece of 'Shun upon his elephant' supports the belief that the 'golden age' emperors *were* men living amongst men. Mencius said: "Shun was a man as I am a man." "Yao and Shun were the same as other men." (A modern belief that the Sages never did live upon earth, seemingly arises from the same misconception that caused people to weave legends about and to deify their inspired leaders.) The pre-eminently wise men who existed on earth in primitive, prehistoric times, had been found worthy to be chosen and taught in order to guide others to find the Way.

I. MEARS

Easter Island: Home of the Scornful Gods. By ROBERT J. CASEY. (The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Indianapolis, U. S. A. $ 4·00)

Mr. Casey, who manages to combine the humour and imagination of a story-teller with the more sober qualities of an archæologist, takes his readers with him on the thirty-four ton schooner he has chartered at Tahiti, and designed for other purposes, across two and a half thousand miles of ocean to Easter Island. The chronometer is out of order; navigation is guess-work; and we despair, at times of weathering the storms we encounter. But this voyage is, we suspect, largely experimental. Mr. Casey really wants to know whether the journey could ever have been made in canoes.

In the second part of the book, the author makes us experience all the melancholy of an ancient and barren land, which has played its part in the great scheme, run its course, and is spent. In attempting to probe the mystery of Easter Island, one finds oneself at every conjecture, involved finally in deeper mystery, Mr. Casey says. But this is a truism; there are not several mysteries; there is only one mystery, that of our own minds. Patanjali is lucid on the subject, and just a few writers, de Maupassant and Mr. Bernard Shaw are among the number, have made the discovery themselves.

Mr. Casey is no doubt right, however, in tracing the origin of the Polynesian race to the Indo-Chinese peninsula. Maori legend attributes it to Uru, which the author takes to be Ur. The emigrants from Chaldea travelled to Vrihia where "ari" grows, later to be pushed onwards again in a search for unpopulated lands. It is curious, Mr. Casey points out, that the Sanscrit name for India, and this name for rice should have been preserved in the Polynesian tradition, more especially as no rice is grown in the South Pacific.

The colossal statues of Easter Island —some five hundred in number—were carved, lying upon their backs—from rocks of volcanic tufa. As they are thickly planted about the island, and although of different sizes are similar in feature, they represent evidently, a god, whose universality is thus shown, as was that of Osiris by his scattered members and that of Krishna by the number of his arms. As elsewhere in the ancient world, there were greater and lesser gods whose powers varied, so on Easter Island there are greater and lesser images—the latter, also possibly, representing the attributes of the former.

While the highly polished and finished masonry of the wall at Vinapu and that of the cove at Tangariki shows much resemblance to the skilled workmanship of the American monuments, the ornamentation of the latter is lacking in Easter Island. It well may be, however, that there existed once a continent by which its archaic civilization reached the West coast of South America, for had it arrived from the Atlantic, it would undoubtedly have chosen the fertile Eastern plains upon which to settle.

Mr. Casey rejects the theory of a lost continent on the evidence of ocean soundings in the Pacific. Yet, it is tempting to imagine such a continent, after repeated eruptions and disturbances, giving rise to the Andes, and splitting up into numerous groups of islands and archipelagoes, many of which, in their turn, have disappeared. Such a theory would support Mr. Stimson's research evidences undertaken for the Bishop Museum of Honolulu, and Mr. Casey's practical conclusions respecting a migration from the Indo-Chinese peninsula to the Society Islands in the first place, for it is at this centre that Mr. Stimson discovers the origin of a language from which the dialects of Hawaii, New Zealand, and Easter Island have sprung.

One point, however, is certain. When the terraced platforms were built, Easter was already an island shaped as it is at present, for the walls with their backs to the sea completely encircle its thirty-five mile circumference. There is no reason to ascribe a higher antiquity to the statues than to the platforms. The two examples of this sculpture at the British Museum are unfortunately placed for an examination of their backs, the symbols upon which, although of importance in determining their antiquity, Mr. Casey does not mention. Upon the smaller statue, there is carving which might easily be mistaken for the "crux ansata" of ancient Egypt, but closer inspection shows that it is a girdle with clasp to which a cloth passing between the legs is attached, as worn until lately by the natives of the Island. On the other statue is engraved among other indistinguishable devices, a pair of paddles and a tern, a sea bird invested with the properties of a god to save the species from destruction on an island where food was always scarce.

Some of the images, thirty-five feet high and weighing forty tons, are buried up to their necks, while others seem to be as exposed as when first erected; and some are more weather worn than others, belonging evidently to different periods. But when Admiral Roggeween discovered the island in 1772 he saw the natives performing rites before the statues and concludes that they were sun worshippers. Later, La Perouse reports that the Indians displayed a kind of reverence for the images.

From this it appears evident that the ancient worship persisted up to the time of the Peruvian slave raid, when sages and chiefs alike were carried off to perish in the South American guano fields. Thus the last traditions of Easter Island culture were lost.

L. E. PARKER

The mystery surrounding Easter Island is great. H. P. Blavatsky wrote much about it and all that follows is culled from her writings:—

The mystery that surrounds Easter Island is as great as ever, in spite of the fact that its history was fully outlined by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Secret Doctrine* almost half a century ago.

This island occupies an isolated position in the Pacific Ocean, about two thousand miles off the coast of South America. It is approximately twelve miles long and four miles broad, and is dotted with craters which have not been active within the memory of man. The main interest of Easter Island, however, centres around the gigantic statues whose history still remains a matter of conjecture to the scientific mind.

When Captain Cook first explored the island, he found statues measuring 27 feet in height and 8 feet across the shoulders lying on the ground, and others of even greater dimensions still standing erect. One of the latter was so tall that its shade was sufficient to shelter thirty people from the heat of the sun. The platforms supporting these colossal figures range from 30 to 40 feet in length, and from 12 to 16 feet in breadth and are built in the same Cyclopean style that characterizes the temple walls of Panchacamac and the ruins of Tia Huanaca. Four of these images are found in Ronororaka, three of them deeply embedded in the soil and the fourth resting on the back of its head, in the position of a sleeping man. Though all belong to the long-headed type, there is a great diversity in features, indicating that they were portraits of different individuals, not images of religious worship. Certain distinguishing marks—such as their head-dress, for instance—distinctly show that the originals were not savages of the stone age, but belonged to a civilization already in a high state of development. The distinctly sensual type of their features, however, indicates that their tendency was rather towards sorcery than Adeptship. Two of these statues now stand outside the British Museum, attracting attention and curiosity from the tourist and the student.

A comparison of the Easter Island statues with those remarkable stone figures found near Bamian in Central Asia brings out some points which should not be overlooked. Both have

preserved a record of the existence of prehistoric races of giants for men of the present day. But while the five Bamian statues embody the history of *all* the giant races which preceded our own, the Easter Island statues tell the tale of but a *single* race. The Bamian figures depict the gradual decrease in size of the various races, while the Easter Island figures—being of a more or less uniform height of from 20 to 30 feet—show the approximate size of only *one* particular race of giants.

These statues are by no means the only records that we possess. The literature and traditions of all ancient peoples are full of references to 'giant races'. India had her Danavas and Daityas, Ceylon her Rakshasas, Greece her Titans, Egypt her colossal Heroes, Chaldea her Izdubars, the Jews their *Emims* and the famous giants Anakim, Og and Goliath. The second volume of *The Secret Doctrine* is filled with references to these colossal ancestors of ours, and fully explains the process by which the human race has gradually dwindled to its present size.

If the Easter Islanders were giants in physical stature, must we necessarily assume that they were pigmies in intelligence and knowledge? If we examine the symbols and glyphs engraved on the tablets and statues our question will receive an illuminating answer.

In every ancient system of cosmogony, the growth and development of the Kosmos were recorded in geometrical figures. Every record began with a circle, a point, a triangle and a cube, ending with the Pythagorean *decade*—the sum total of all. This *decade* and its numberless combinations are found in every portion of the globe: in India, Egypt, Chaldea, Peru, Mexico and North America.

They are also found on the Easter Island relics, and show that the early inhabitants of this place could not possibly have been Neolithic savages, but on the contrary must have possessed both mathematical and metaphysical knowledge, and must have been in communication with other parts of the globe where these same symbols were known. Even the cross appears engraved upon the back of some of the statues, showing the great antiquity of that particular symbol.

Not only were the Easter Islanders connected with other parts of the world by their common knowledge, but certain facts go to prove the existence of a universal language as well. Despite the fact that New Zealand, the Sandwich Islands and Easter Island are separated from one another by a distance of from 800 to 1000 leagues, and that the aboriginal inhabitants of these islands could not possibly have communicated with one another before the arrival of the Europeans, yet we find all of them speaking dialects of one original mother-tongue, able to understand one another without difficulty, and having almost identical customs and religious beliefs.

There can be but one logical explanation of such facts as these, and it may be found among the traditions of the people themselves. When Louis Jacolliot visited Polynesia many years ago, he found the natives of the different islands unaware of one another's existence; but in every case it was maintained that *that particular island* had at one time formed part of an immense continent which extended toward the West, on the Asian side. When they were asked 'Where is the cradle of your race?' without exception they extended their hands toward the setting sun. In both Malacca and Polynesia, which form the two extremes of the oceanic world, there is a common belief: All these islands once formed two great continents, the one inhabited by yellow, the other by dark men, and that the Ocean punished them for their incessant quarrelling by swallowing them up.

Fifty years ago only a few intrepid souls were brave enough to assert their belief in these buried continents. Jacolliot, the author of "*Histoire des Vierges : les Peuples et les Continents Disparus*," who devoted many years to the study of the religion, language and customs of the Polynesians, says:

> One of the most ancient legends of India preserved in the temples by oral and written traditions, relates that several hundred thousand years ago there existed in the Pacific Ocean an immense continent which was destroyed by geological upheaval, and the fragments of which must be sought in Madagascar, Ceylon, Sumatra, Java, Borneo and the principal isles of Polynesia. As to the Polynesian continent which disappeared at the time of the final geological cataclysms its existence rests upon such proofs that to be logical we can doubt no longer.

Mr. A. R. Wallace, in his *Malay Archipelago* arrives at the following conclusion after a review of the evidence on hand:

> The inference that we must draw from these facts is undoubtedly that the whole of the islands eastwards beyond Borneo and Sumatra do essentially form part of a former Australian or Pacific continent.

Even Haeckel, in his *Pedigree of Man*, traces the cradle of the human race to

> Lemuria, a continent that lay to the South of Asia, and sank later on beneath the surface of the Indian Ocean.

As early as 1877 H. P. Blavatsky offered the theory of a submerged continent as the only plausible explanation of such mysteries as that of Easter Island. Eleven years later, in *The Secret Doctrine*, she elaborated this theory, giving the full history of both Atlantis and Lemuria and a description of their inhabitants, their culture and their disappearance beneath the sea. She refutes the ideas of those archæologists who would place the date of the Easter Island statues within the Christian era, and says that the continent of Lemuria sank beneath the sea some four million years ago. In regard to the architecture of the Lemurians she says:—

> We find the Lemurians in their sixth sub-race building their first rock-cities out of stone and lava. One of such great cities of primitive structure was built entirely of lava, some thirty miles west from where Easter Island now stretches its narrow piece of sterile ground . . . . . and was entirely destroyed by a series of volcanic eruptions. The oldest remains of Cyclopean buildings were all the handiwork of the Lemurians of the last sub-races . . . The first large cities, however, appeared on that region of the continent which is now known as the island of Madagascar. (*The Secret Doctrine*, II. 317)

Those who are interested in Easter Island and who are looking for authentic information concerning the prehistoric races and continents would do well to make a serious study of this volume.

LEONA GRUGAN

The Greeks. By ROSALIND MURRAY. (A. & C. Black, London. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

This is an interesting little book, written in a pleasing style and quite suitable for the How and Why Series.

People are so prone to think that the discoveries and inventions of the present era are absolutely new, that it is a delightful surprise to meet a volume which is not only willing to admit, but ready to prove, that the Greeks were far ahead of our age in many ways—science, philosophy, architecture, government, and various other fields of activity. Unfortunately, however, Miss Murray does not appear to have all her information quite accurate. For example, on what authority does she state that the statues of Buddha found in India, China and Japan are adaptations of the Greek statues of Apollo?

But the question: where did the Greeks obtain their knowledge and inspiration? A nation is certainly not born with a wealth of culture, but has received it as a heritage from the hands of another nation older and more experienced than itself. Herodotus, the "Father of History," confesses more than once that Greece owed everything to Egypt, who obtained her knowledge from the Chaldeans, who in turn received their learning from India, the cradle of the Aryan race. If one wishes to go still further back, one finds that the Greeks are, in reality, the descendants of the old Atlanteans. (*The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. II, p. 743)

Let us not forget that the real mission of Greece was to serve as a gateway through which the spiritual treasures of the East were able to penetrate into the West, and thus enrich the life and ideals of the Western world.

M. F.

The Prisoner's Soul and Our Own. By EIVIND BERGGRAV, Bishop of Tromsö. Translated by LAURA GRAVELY. (J. M. Dent & Sons, London. 6*s.*)

In Norway they have two kinds of prisons—the isolation and the association. It is in a prison run on the cell or isolation system that Bishop Berggrav has made his observations as chaplain. And his book has been written partly to show what mistaken notions most people have of prisons and prisoners, partly to express his conviction derived from experience that no man is so evil that he has not something of good in him. You may lose faith in society in a prison, he tells us, but nothing you see will ever make you lose faith in man.

The Norwegian cell prison seems wonderfully humane. There are cheerful colours, pictures, books, and tools kept in the cell. The dress and style of hair of the prisoners are normal. Plenty of work is given them, with pay,—carpentry, book-binding, shoe-making, and so on. Liberal probation is granted for good conduct. The attitude of the staff is firm yet sympathetic. In such an atmosphere one feels that the system is given its best chance. Does it succeed? Is it curative for both mind and body?

Undoubtedly the cell system has great advantages. It provides opportunity for self-examination, a regular life, and the discipline of quiet. Alcoholists, for instance, apparently stand solitude well. It often cures them. The system brings out traits in human nature usually concealed or undeveloped—love for living things, such as a bulb, a spider, or a canary; redeeming love for the mother or the wife; desire for work—carpentry is easily the most popular craft; affection for the home and for domestic festivals such as Christmas. Its drawbacks are that constant self-examination tends towards self-pity unless rightly guided; and that unless responsibilities, *i. e.* temptations, are gradually introduced there is a reversion to infantility. So many resolutions to "run straight" are made in prisons where temptation is absent. Almost as many are broken when the full pressure of temptation is felt on release.

To admit that the cell system has a curative value is not, however, to justify it. Those who have visited the Oslo prison condemn the inhuman isolation and torture of spirit which the cell system creates there, as elsewhere. It is astonishing that kindly Bishop Berggrav should have grown almost to love such hateful conditions, for nowhere does he roundly condemn them; nor does he make it clear that the association prison, despite its difficulties, is greatly to be preferred.

But on the whole the message of Bishop Berggrav is one of glowing hope. Rightly run, one feels that the system of modified isolation has tremendous possibilities. The prisoners understand that their confinement is expiative, and they can see its reformative value. But they cannot and will not appreciate that they are dangerous to society. To ask a prisoner to accept this view is, says the Bishop, psychologically brutal. Where the reformative value fails is in the faulty relation of time sentences to true justice, and the fact that the memory of misdeeds becomes blurred with time.

Does prison life bring out the religion in a man? Very seldom, apparently. A man has to find himself before he can find God; and though prison audiences are the most attentive and emotionally responsive of all audiences, though they soak up all words like dry sponges, yet the impression made is like that in a piece of rubber—merely momentary. A healthy scepticism, on a basis of hope, is the only effective attitude to the seemingly religious prisoner, Bishop Berggrav has found.

This book is so full of human nature, and so illuminates the minds of people whom society ordinarily shuns as evil, that it deserves to be read by all who wish to understand prisons without repugnance and without sentimentality. And it convinces one that prisoners, after all, are very much like ourselves.

G. W. W.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE SENSE OF SIN

If the Kingdom of Heaven is within us, so are the sulphurous flames of Hell. Just as Amitabha dwells in the heart of every man, so does the stern Yama-Raja, the judge of his soul. Even while we listen to and obey the counsels of Mr. Worldly-Wiseman, Yama-Raja, apparently asleep, is really wide awake.

When Prince Nekhludof, the hero of Tolstoy's immortal work *Resurrection*, discloses to his maid-servant his determination to leave nothing undone in the effort to save the woman he had wronged, even going to the length of marrying her if necessary, Agraphena tries to comfort him, and if possible to dissuade him from his plans, with these words:

> Of course you can do what you please, but I must say I can't see that it's any particular fault of yours. Such things happen to everybody, and if people use their common sense affairs like that are soon overlooked and forgotten.

Such "common sense," certainly counsels a man to turn a deaf ear to his conscience whenever convenient. And it was with precisely the same sort of argument that young Nekhludof had years ago attempted vainly to ease his conscience on the morning following his seduction of Katusha, though in his heart he knew that he had played a dastardly and cruel part in his dealings with an innocent virgin. "The same thing had happened to So-and-so, and with Uncle So-and-so, and with his own father," he had then argued; "and if every body does it, how can it be helped?"

Yet he knew that he had forfeited his own self-respect, and could neither look an honest man in the face nor blame a fellow-sinner. However, he soon succeeded in forgetting the past, so that "in these latter days it never came into his mind". Time had brought him his cup of nepenthe! We praise Time for the miracles it works, but Time also helps us to forget the wrongs which we inflict on others. So Nekhludof would have married a lovely and clever princess, and lived with her a life of wealth and luxury for the rest of his days, commanding the respect of those about him and allowing his past to bury itself in oblivion. But as a Buddhist would say his karma had prescribed for him a different course, for Katusha's trial by jury brought home to him again, even more vividly than before, the enormity of his own offence, aggravated as it was now by the realization of his responsibility in unwittingly condemning an innocent woman to penal servitude.

Tolstoy is careful to describe Nekhludof as a man, who in spite of his illicit relations with women had preserved a more tender conscience than the common run of the Russian aristocracy of his time. Had he possessed a little more "common sense," he could easily have lulled his conscience to sleep again, and pursued his career in the orthodox fashion.

Most men, all over the world, do so. Nay, they go further, and, not only do they deceive themselves and the world, but, they judge and condemn others. Even when they admit their sins, they quickly find out plausible excuses for them. "If I hadn't seduced her some one else would probably have; and besides, she tempted me as much as I tempted her." In the case of certain crimes, we blame society or the State and not the offenders, especially when we ourselves are guilty of the same offence. We argue, that such crimes are the inevitable products of lamentable social conditions, as if man were an automaton, reacting to environmental influences!

Stern self-criticism is almost as rare in the East to-day as it is in the West, and like Agraphena Petrovna most of us question the wisdom of a man who

follows conscientiously his own inner divine voice.

Society is exacting in calling upon every one to conform to its rules and conventions, and indifferent to man's inner spiritual attitude. People soon acquire the habit of obeying society and disregarding the betterment of their own soul. But all great men have discovered for themselves (at what a cost!) that it is the spirit that really matters. "It is man's soul that Christ is always looking for," wrote Oscar Wilde and added that "one realizes one's soul only by getting rid of all alien passions, all acquired culture, and all external possessions, be they good or evil".

A true Buddhist tries, or should try, to normalize his life, and to keep the normal state of perfect balance or unity in time of emergency. Such a condition is ordinarily described as the mind having complete control of the flesh. In reality there should be no semblance of control or domination one way or the other, for that would imply force and restraint, with the possibility or danger of rebellion. In an ideal normalized life body and soul are perfectly at peace with each other, or *are one*. Such a life, permanently maintained, is worthy of a Bodhisattva. But in the ordinary man, possessing a keen conscience, the conflict between his higher spirituality and his baser animal nature is frequent and unavoidable; and in some cases so sharp that it eventually leads him into a monastic or other forms of religious life, or into a life of self-sacrifice and willing service of his fellow-men. And when one realizes how grave one's offences are, not necessarily in the eyes of the law or of society (which recognizes and punishes only crude forms of crime) but in the judgment of one's own conscience, then does one begin seriously to ask oneself, "Shall I ever fully atone for my sins while on this earth, however hard I may strive? Shall I not have to spend many lives for their atonement, if indeed there be such future births in store for me? So numerous and so grave are my sins, that I begin to doubt if ever I shall make full amends for them with my own sadly-limited powers".

It is such overwhelming realization that finally determined Honen and Shinran, two of Japan's greatest religious teachers, to leave the old traditional school of self-discipline and, in the midst of strong opposition, preach the gospel of absolute faith in Amitabha.

Yokkaichi, Japan M. G. MORI

PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIETY

May I write about Prof. A. R. Wadia's article in January ARYAN PATH? It seems to me that one of the first points to make is about the difference between philosophy which is love of truth and the speculative deductions from materialistic scientific findings. As I see it, the philosophy of a people cannot be a series of speculations put forward by any man, even of titanic mentality, but rather the principles used naturally in every day life by those people. Therefore, if Prof. Wadia wishes to know the philosophy of the West he must judge it by our systems of governments, economics, international relationships, and above all by our every day life.

But, what Prof. Wadia refers to as a nations's philosophy is doubtless the culmination of ideas in the finest minds of a race. But then he ignores the hypothesis of absolute knowledge or unchanging truth. He does not conceive of anything higher than mind, nor any man capable of transcending his mind and seeing truth in a deeper and more comprehensive way. Is not this the reason that he is enamoured of western philosophy? Would he like his countrymen, and especially country women to live as men and women live here—say in my neighbourhood at Hollywood?

Los Angeles, U. S. A. M. D.

THE BUDDHA IN NEW INDIA

The Hindu philosophy of life originates in the Vedic hymns, defines itself in the Upanishadic intuitions and finally reaches a culmination in the *true* Vedant philosophy, the key to which, however, has been missing for long. The contribution which Buddha made to the eclectic Hindu philosophy, has been almost always misunderstood and misjudged; He has been condemned as an enemy of Vedic tradition.

The crux of the question centres in the meaning of the term 'soul' and colossal changes in the religious history of India have resulted from no greater cause than a mere misjudging of connotation! It is as interesting as helpful to realize the truth of the theosophic view that beyond the plane of social conventionality words become alive in proportion to the intensity of thought and that they are in truth the 'living messengers' deserving our utmost care and reverence. That literature can hold a mirror up to the age to which it belongs, is indeed due to the power of words which open up suggestive avenues for insight into human experience. India could have been saved from tremendous spiritual set-backs if clearer cognition of the term 'soul' had been possible during, and immediately after, Buddha's times. And India of to-day needs in no less degree the clarification of that very term, since the spiritualistic, the psychical, and the ultra-academic distortions of the true meaning of that term are getting an easy vogue.

It is therefore necessary, to draw the attention of all to the opening article "Soul What *Is* It?" in THE ARYAN PATH for March 1931. While a critical consideration of that article will unfold the Theosophical significance of the term 'soul,' a comparative study of Mrs. Rhys Davids' two articles appearing in your last May and June numbers actually proves the constructive character of Buddha's mission and reveals his affinity with the Vedic and the Upanishadic teaching.

Buddha *did* annihilate the soul: he laughed out the immortality, and also challenged the very spirituality of the soul. But the soul which was his victim was the finite and the personal, the soul that craved for a loose life in heaven, of passion and passivity, the soul that sought to secure that heaven by means of vicious *karmakanda*—ignorant, dark, and mischievous practice of rituals. This initial negation and destruction, however, was only the first phase in his constructive plan of "fulfilling and expanding the central teaching of the Upanishads". Mrs. Rhys Davids shows in her articles how the collective consciousness of India of B. C. 600 to 500 was straining and striving after a More, was hungering after a fuller and richer experience.

Apart from the world of ideas and philosophical meanings the tangible results of Buddha's constructive programme and his affinity with Vedic tradition can be traced and ascertained by a study of the social life of his times. Swami Jagadiswarananda has mentioned a few connections between the Vedic and the Buddhistic art-forms in his pamphlet *Buddhism and the Vedas*; and in the April-May number of the *Mahabodhi* Dr. A. L. Nair of Bombay has given some suggestive hints as regards the educational, the agricultural and commercial ameliorations which have originated in the efforts and teaching of the Enlightened One.

All these are certainly a sign of the times—Buddha's influence must regain predominance in the New India which is emerging.

Bombay D. G. V.

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"_____ends of verse
And sayings of philosophers."

HUDIBRAS.

A very interesting article by Mr. Frank Malland in *The Times* of 13th April led the discussion on the subject of belief in witchcraft among African natives; the discussion was about the best method which the ruling Whites should devise to free the population from this " shadow," "curse," etc., "which is co-extensive with native life and thought". All the correspondents who commented on his article, as Mr. Malland himself, possess first hand knowledge of African life and administration.

The points of interest to the intelligent believer in magic, and we do believe in it, are :—(1) that ridicule or denial of magic is no remedy; (2) that the existing law should be altered, for, the present attitude "appears preposterous to the natives," who "regard Europeans as we regard the colour-blind or the tone-deaf, deficient in one sense, and they carry on on the evidence of their own senses"; (3) that the official and the missionary should be given "anthropological training, sufficient to enable him really to appreciate the outlook on magic and religion of the primitive peoples" which outlook is regarded as childish and foolish. Mr. Malland complains that "we make all divination illegal—even for ascertaining what spirit is reincarnated in a new born babe". In his original article he says :—

> We confine ourselves to persecuting those who are fighting what they believe to be the most evil and unnatural curse that afflicts mankind, and who do but hold the belief that was held by Lord Bacon, Raleigh, Lord Coke, Cranmer, Knox, Calvin, Wesley, and many other men of intellect and culture.

The one aim of the discussion is the finding of the best means to eradicate this " rank superstition". Even when the education of the administrator is suggested it is with a view to his bringing the believer in magic to a sense of the impossibility of the existence of witches. We doubt not that in Africa as elsewhere there is superstition, and that witch-doctors take advantage of it. They use the same force which politicians use to exploit young patriots or the priests to exploit devotees. What is that force ?—credulity and ignorance. Even in the name of modern science such exploitation takes place; and we are not blind to the existence of the same phenomenon in certain so-called theosophical circles.

Between credulity and incredulity there is no difference. What is wanted is knowledge and not merely the knack of handling the witch, the witch-doctor, and the believer in both. Neither anthropology nor psychology explain what magic is; there are half-a-dozen "scientific" theories, but all of them fail to satisfy the real student of the subject. Most enquirers start with a predilection in favour of or against some particular view, exactly as all these correspondents to *The Times* do. Why assume that it is superstition? or fraud ? or fanaticism ? or even auto-suggestion and self-hypnosis? These terms themselves need defining.

Etymologically Magic is the science of the Magi, the Wise, but nowadays it is regarded as the science of the conjurer. Theosophy believes in magic but not in miracle, and offers help to the honest-minded researcher. The first step he is recommended to take is a study of the following postulates, which will turn out to be axioms, if he is earnest and patient in his search :—

I. There is no miracle. Everything that happens is the result of law—eternal, immutable, ever active. Apparent miracle is but the operation of forces undetected by science.

II. Magic is spiritual Wisdom; nature, the material ally, pupil and servant of the Magician.

III. Nature is triune: there is a visible, objective Nature; an invisible, indwelling, energizing nature, the exact model of the other, and its vital principle; and above these two Spirit, source of all forces, alone eternal, and indestructible. The lower two constantly change; the higher third does not.

IV. Man is also triune : he has his objective physical body; his vitalizing astral body (or soul) the real man; and these two are brooded over and illuminated by the third—the sovereign, immortal Spirit. When the real man succeeds in merging himself with the latter, he becomes an immortal entity.

V. The trinity of nature is the lock of magic, the trinity of man the key that fits it.

VI. Magic, as a science, is a knowledge of these principles, and of the way by which the omniscience and omnipotence of the Spirit and its control over nature's forces may be acquired by the individual while still in the body. Magic, as an art, is the application of this knowledge in practice.

VII. Arcane knowledge misapplied, is sorcery; beneficently used, true magic, or Wisdom.

The following is extracted from the stenographic report of the presidential address of Madame Sophia Wadia delivered at the Buddha anniversary in Bombay on the 21st of May 1932 :—

> "Cease from evil, do good." To do good, but what is good, and how to do it ? He asked us to live normally, *i. e.* according to the Norm of the Universe of which man is an integral part. The Good which the Buddha defined is as profound and as far-reaching as His conception of Evil. Look for the Pattern of the Universe, He said. The stars in the firmament, crystals under ground, pearls as oysters of the sea, all show a pattern; a protoplasmic cell as the human

body is founded on a pattern; the rose-bud blossoms, and the star of jessamine falls according to pattern. Life, taught the Great Buddha, is a mighty Wheel of Perpetual Motion. That great universal Wheel or Chakra contains within itself numberless smaller wheels, so that each being has his own wheel of life, with a pattern all its own, and which pattern changes with the present motion. The praying wheel of the Buddhist is a graphic symbol which conveys this fundamental truth. Your life, my life, the life of every one, is a wheel with a pattern and a motion—the pattern is the result of past karma, and represents what we know as fate or destiny; the motion on the other hand, is the energy of present karma, present action, and stands for the effort of our free-will, our self-energization, and self-choice. Please note the two aspects of karma, by present motion or endeavour we change the pattern of past karma, thus building our future fate through our own self-induced and self-devised efforts. Ordinarily, people define all pleasant things as good karma, and all unpleasant as evil karma. The Buddhist's conception of good is of a very different order. To become good, to bring out the good in us, we must try and reproduce in our own wheel of life that pattern which is in harmony with the Pattern of the great universal Wheel. The praying wheel moves with every chant—Aum Mani, Padme Hum. Have you thought of the significance of this practice? It teaches us that our present effort which moves the wheel of life should be in accordance with the wisdom enshrined in that great and potent Mantra—Aum Mani, Padme Hum. What does the sentence mean? It is generally translated as "Oh, the Jewel in the Lotus," but it really means much more, for it refers to and explains the profound truth about the nature of good. How? The Great Universe and the small man are intimately and indissolubly linked. The sentence really means, "I am in thee and thou art in me" or "I am *that* I am".

To do good or to be good implies that we must seek for the universal Pattern in the performance of the daily duties of life; that good which the Buddha asked us to perform frees us from bondage. Good works of the ordinary kind are binding, and bondage, in the final analysis, means pain and suffering. That real and spiritual kind of good which liberates, manifests only when we incorporate in our individual lives universal aspects. Within each one of us is a Universal Being, the future Nirvanee, the future Buddha. The awakening of that slumbering divine consciousness spontaneously begets this real kind of goodness, very different from our personal concept of what goodness is. Each one—mother, father, child; labourer or merchant; soldier or priest; each one, must revolve his wheel and pray: Aum Mani, Padme Hum; Aum Mani, Padme Hum. In doing our acts and in living our lives, in the daily performance of duty, we must shape ourselves according to the Divine Pattern of the Universal Wheel. This, by the way, is the same truth which our Hindu philosophy imparts through its magnificent pantheon of gods and goddesses. For every walk in life, for every stage in evolution, for every age and condition, there is an appropriate God or Goddess; different people worship different gods and goddesses, *i. e.* they try to become worthy of relationship with them. And in the real sense, man, the microcosm, carries within himself the entire pantheon which is of the Great Universe, the Macrocosm.

ॐ

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light ! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. III AUGUST 1932 No. 8

WAR AND PEACE

During this month of August India will celebrate Krishna-Jayanti, the Natal Day of Shri Krishna, the loved child, who stole the heart of elders, the adored youth who taught how to play the game of life, the sage counsellor who incessantly laboured for peace, and when necessity compelled led his disciples to the gory field of battle because it was the field of duty. In whatever phase of his incarnation we meet him, we encounter a teacher, a guide, a friend. Ever an inspirer, his deeds are living examples even to-day and his words vibrant with power can be heard in our twentieth century. On his flute he goes on playing the Melody of Life—and "plays, and plays, and plays".

Generally Krishna's philosophy is regarded as martial. This is because the *Gita*, the best known and deservedly popular embodiment of his teachings, is not generally read as a part of the *Mahabharata*. It is read and studied as a piece apart, severed from its context. It is true that the whole of the *Mahabharata* is not of equal and uniform value; it may be true that in course of ages interpolations occurred; but the reader of the *Gita* misses the depth of its message if he does not familiarize himself with the words and deeds of Shri Krishna in other parts of the great epic. The events which precede the war bring out the less known aspect of the life of Krishna, showing that he loved peace more than war, which was forced upon him and his party. Human persuasion, philosophical disquisition, spiritual appeal, were fully used; grave warning was given repeatedly; and only as a last resort, only as a means of upholding

righteousness, justice and truth, did he consent to take the field; and even then, charged with peace and with the power of preserving and sustaining all, he acted as the charioteer, as a guide to his friend and devotee whose duty to war was forced upon him.

Both in its historical and psychological settings, the *Mahabharata* and the *Gita* bring the lesson of peace in preference to war, and war only as a dire necessity for the sake of righteousness and peace. It is a great temptation to analyse and study the political significance of Krishna's diplomatic mission at the court of the blind king Dhritarashtra to disarm his uncontrollable and lusty-minded son, Duryodhana, and to contrast it with the recent attempts at "disarmament," but we must refrain, and turn to the consideration of the more important psychological aspect. If the divine statesman and diplomat, the eloquent and righteous Krishna, did not succeed in bringing Duryodhana to sense and peace, it is not to be expected that MacDonalds and Mussolinis, Hoovers and Herriots, will. No, we must go to the root cause—human passion and anger and greed (kāma, krodha, lobha) which are "the gates of hell".

All evolution proceeds from within outwardly; the phenomenon of war in the visible world is but a materialization of the psychological and invisible war between the impulse and the idea, between the blood and the brain, in the heart of man. In the constitution of every man the mean and the selfish elements are present. Lust and love, anger and mercy, avarice and charity fight in each one of us. The Eternal War is between our past and our future, between our fate and free-will, between our instincts and aspirations. That war can be and has to be ended. Then only is ours the experience of the Immortals —the Living in the Eternal Now.

The way to lasting peace begins with a perception. The woe of the world is rooted in human soil. The sap which helps its growth is the personal self of man.

Krishna, the Man of Peace, has taught that neither torture of the body, nor the eradication of the force of desire will precipitate lasting peace. Such antics may blind us to the existence of war and all other evils which permeate our very being. Recognize their existence, accord them their due place in the scheme of things, use them instead of being used by them—this is the striking message of Krishna.

Evil begins its life in the human kingdom. The force which manifests as the force of evil in men cannot be destroyed; it can only be transformed. Spiritual exercises are not for the extermination of the lower nature but for transforming it. This world will not improve if men quit it; this earth which every day is revealing

new hells built by the hands of passion and greed, will begin to unveil the beauties of heaven when men construct with compassion and understanding. To raise the self by the Self—that is the real way to world-peace. Given a certain number of men and women in each community and country who have overcome their own spirit of greed and competition, and the peace of that community and country is assured. Krishna teaches this peculiar form of other-worldliness, which is not a loathing but a loving of this world. This is the basic idea of Raja Yoga, the Royal Road to the Kingdom of Peace.

And now we will let the reader ponder over and apply the lesson of the following extracts from Bhagavat Yana Parva (belonging to Udyoga Parva of the *Mahabharata*) to his own problem, to that of his country, and to that of the world at large :—

Krishna to Duryodhana:

> Great is the advantage in Peace to both sides. Peace, however, does not recommend itself to thee! To what else can it be due but to thy loss of understanding? If one's understanding is confounded one can never turn his attention to what is beneficial. One that hath his soul under control never disregardeth any body in the three worlds—no, not even the commonest creature.

Duryodhana to Krishna :

> Thou doest always censure me. Indeed thyself and all reproach me alone and not any other. I, however, do not find the least fault in myself. I do not even after reflection behold any grave fault in me, or even any fault however minute.

Krishna to Duryodhana :

> The disposition that thou art repeatedly manifesting is of the perverse kind. Persistence in such behaviour is sinful. Do not yield thyself to the influence of wrath! The exertions of the wise are always associated with Virtue, Profit, and Desire. If indeed all these three cannot be attained, men follow at least virtue and profit. If these three are pursued separately, it is seen that they who have their hearts under control choose virtue; they who are neither good nor bad, but occupy a middle station, choose profit which is always the subject of dispute; while they that are fools choose the gratification of desire! The fool who from temptation giveth up virtue and pursueth profit and desire by unrighteous means is soon destroyed by his senses. He who seeketh profit and desire should yet practise virtue at the outset, for neither profit nor desire is really dissociated from virtue. He who seeketh all three, may, by the aid of virtue alone, grow like fire when brought into contact with a heap of dry grass. He who behaveth falsely towards those that live and conduct themselves righteously, certainly cutteth down his own self like the forest with an axe.

Krishna to Dhritarashtra and his Court :

> Listen to me, ye sinless ones! The words I will speak will soon lead to beneficial results, if indeed ye accept what I say in consequence of its recommending itself to you. Forcibly seize and bind this wicked king in the enjoyment of sovereignty; the time hath come for doing this. For the sake of a family, an individual may be sacrificed. For the sake of a village, a family may be sacrificed. For the sake of a province, a village may be sacrificed. And lastly, for the sake of one's Self, the whole earth may be sacrificed. Bind Duryodhana fast, make peace with the Pandavas. Let not the whole Kshatriya race be slaughtered on thy account.

LOCKE'S MESSAGE FOR TO-DAY

[**Dorothy Turner, M. A., B. Sc., Ph. D. (London)**, formerly a Research Assistant at University College, London, is now a lecturer at the Komensky University of Bratislava (Czechoslovakia). She is the author of several works on the History of Science and the History of Science Teaching. Her article comprises her thoughts on the Tercentenary of the birth of the English philosopher. We might well quote his last words ere he died on the 26th October 1704: " In perfect charity with all men, and in sincere communion with the whole church of Christ, by whatever names Christ's followers call themselves."—EDS.]

John Locke, the most important figure in English philosophy, was born on August 29th, 1632. This was the year which saw the publication of Galileo's *Dialogues* and much of the active preparation of Descartes. Locke's life thus began when the profoundest changes were working like leaven in the thoughts of men. His mature years witnessed the triumphs of these changes and their influence we find in his philosophy. His life, indeed, spans the period when science first obtained a footing in the lives of men. Since that time it has spread into every corner of civilized life. It was Locke who caught the new ideas and through him they found a place in political thought and have been handed down to our own time. Thus his teachings have a special interest for us as we celebrate the Tercentenary of his birth.

Locke was the philosopher of the English Revolution of 1688. His theory of government justified the revolution in the eyes of the world and his practical wisdom helped England to adjust her government to the new conditions and to stabilize her constitution. Locke's political ideas were the driving force in America nearly a hundred years later when she threw off the English yoke. His teachings, working their way through other minds, helped to bring about the collapse of the outworn medieval system in France which, with its battle cry of Liberty, proclaimed the world-gospel of the rights of men.

Locke's philosophy spread still more when the prestige of England rose after the defeat of Napoleon and her wealth increased after the Industrial Revolution. His principles of freedom, toleration and the sacredness of private property became cherished ideals of nineteenth century thought and dominated the whole social life of western Europe. We, too, have inherited them. But now they are being threatened with destruction on one hand and critically challenged on the other, so that we may well ask how these ideals took their origin and what message their prophet has for us to-day.

The starting point of Locke's thinking is to be found in his early interest in the problems of contemporary science. He used to

try chemical experiments himself and discuss them with Robert Boyle who was his friend for many years. Locke also studied medicine and was an occasional practitioner. He was in close friendship with the great physician Thomas Sydenham and used to accompany him on visits to his patients. In later life, Locke was privileged by intercourse with Newton and other Fellows of the Royal Society. The close contact with scientific thought is evident throughout all his writings.

In the middle period of his life Locke was brought into the vortex of political affairs. He was for many years in the household of the famous Earl of Shaftesbury to whom he acted as secretary, family physician and educational adviser. Through him, Locke met prominent Whigs and learnt much of the details of government service and the trend of political thought. After the fall of Shaftesbury, Locke spent some years on the Continent where he met men of science and of letters, many of them political refugees. During these years his ideas on the basis of society and on the art of government were taking shape and his opinions becoming known. Meanwhile, in England, events were moving fast, culminating in the Revolution of 1688. Thereafter Locke had nothing to fear. The following year, therefore, he returned to England and found welcome and fame awaiting him.

Until his return, Locke had published only minor works. He was now in his fifty-seventh year, rich with the experience of many years of thought and with freedom to make his opinions known. One book therefore followed another in quick succession. His *Letters on Toleration* appeared in 1689, a work pleading for religious liberty. In February 1690 appeared his *Two Treatises on Government* and a month later, his great *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, a work long expected and upon which he had laboured at intervals for nearly twenty years. In the years that followed there appeared several studies on practical problems such as the effect of the lowering of interest on the value of money and on the coinage. A few years before his death in 1704 appeared his treatise on education and studies dealing mainly with religious toleration.

Like the men of science of his day, Locke began by making a clean sweep of old notions and built up his principles from the whole range of particular instances coming within his experience. Though he occasionally poked fun at those who were always busy with telescopes and quadrants, yet his whole thought was based on the enquiring, experimenting and analysing methods of the man of science. In his theory of knowledge, Locke rejected the old notion of *innate ideas*. It had always been so convenient for philosophers to call a principle innate when it defied explanation according to their schemes. But Locke would

have none of this and declared that all our ideas are the result of experience, being based upon reflection and sensation. In working out the growth of ideas, Locke distinguished between what the mind perceives and what is due to the mind itself, in other words between primary and secondary qualities. The distinction which goes back to Democritus, had been set forth clearly by Galileo to whom Locke was directly indebted. The primary qualities of a body were explained by Locke as its boundaries, shape, size, hardness and so forth, its secondary qualities as its colour, taste, smell and our sensations of heat and cold. Thus in a universe in which there were no ears, tongues, noses or other sense organs, the primary qualities would yet remain and we could argue about shape, quantity and motion. Such a universe of primary qualities was the one explored by Galileo, Newton and their followers. Such was the realm of extension and motion of Descartes and such the world of "external objects" from which, according to Locke, the mind derived its ideas. This view of externality was of immeasurable service in the hands of Locke in freeing philosophy from many obscurities. His emphasis, too, on experience was the very thing that men needed to give them a new outlook on the political problems of their day.

In building up this theory of government, Locke shows how actions must be judged, not according to some supposedly inherent principle of right or wrong but according to their consequences. Thus instead of holding that kings govern by Divine Right, he judges all forms of government according to their effect on the people who are governed:—

> The whole trust, power and authority . . . is vested in him for no other purpose but to be made use of for the good, preservation and peace of men in that society over which he is set, and that this alone is and ought to be the standard and measure according to which he ought to square and proportion his laws, model and frame his government.

This sane principle of government for the good of the governed lies at the basis of all Locke's theory and has become part of the theory though not of the practice of all civilized nations.

Locke's constructive doctrine contains an analysis of the question of property. He says:—

> Every man has a property in his own person . . . the labour of his body and the work of his hands . . . Whatsoever then, he takes out of the State that Nature has provided and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with it and joined it to something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property.

Locke then illustrates his meaning from the cases of reclaiming waste land, ordinary agriculture and industry, showing how the worker has the right to the part of his labour he has "mixed with" the common stock. This last point is important and should be contrasted with Marx's principle that man has a right to the whole of his labour.

Following his doctrine of property, Locke discusses the rights

of man in society. Although he declares that the "natural liberty of man is to be free from any superior power on earth," yet he explains that mankind formed societies for the protection of property and the preservation of peace and safety. The basis of society, he considers, lies in a kind of contract. This fiction of the social contract was used by Locke as a telling illustration of the mutual relationship between individual and State. All Locke's readers knew an ordinary commercial contract to be an agreement in which each side pledges itself to do something provided the other person carries out his obligation as well. Locke explained that when men joined together in societies it was *as if* they made a contract but that their rights remained even after they had relinquished the executing of them to a central government. Thus man's right of doing what he thinks fit for the preservation of life and property and the avenging of wrongs, he exercises through the power of society. But since society exists, according to Locke, for the "safety, peace and public good of the people," and since in what he calls a "perfect democracy" laws are executed by those chosen by the people, he shows that if a government fails to serve the community for which it was called into being, the individuals, by virtue of their original rights, may choose another government. By such arguments, he justified the Revolution of 1688 and refuted the old doctrines of absolute power and Divine Right.

Locke's picture of man as a free member of society enjoying the advantages of society and complying with the rules he has himself helped to make, have come down to us through the Liberal thought of the nineteenth century. Thus after many struggles, we now enjoy Civil and Religious Liberty, Adult Franchise, Self-Government and generous social services including Education, Public Health, and Insurance against Sickness, Unemployment and Old Age. By such means the modern State has taken upon itself more and more the care of the sick and needy and has recognised the right of its members to a voice in the government. Except under Bolshevism and Fascism, the personal rights of individuals have been left to adjust themselves. Thus, while modern States insist that their members do not grow up illiterate, they allow the choice of vocation, the spending and investing of money, the housing, care, number and control of the next generation almost entirely to individual whims. Moreover people are left to the relentless working out of economic forces with the consequent suffering that we see around us to-day. Such *laissez-faire* policy worked very well during the nineteenth century but is wholly unsuited to the highly organized industrialized States of the present day.

We need, in fact, to go back to Locke and include more factors

in our conception of the State. With his wide views in mind, we may be able to strike a better balance between what the State takes upon itself and what it still leaves to individual freedom. We all love the expression "private enterprise" but we know only too well that private interest and social interest by no means always coincide. Private enterprise, backed up by fortuitous circumstances, may involve the exploitation of ignorance and the plunging of thousands in distress. Such evils have always existed but their effects are more serious in these days of large-scale production and world-wide connections than in the early days of simple commerce. Some results we see around us in the muddled world with its anomalies of over-production and mal-distribution with falling prices in some lands and want of the barest necessities of life in others.

To evolve a technique of economic control which shall bring order out of the present confusion will not be easy, but it must be attempted. It may involve a curtailment of those individual liberties we love so much. It will certainly demand collective action between the holders of capital, the bankers, manufacturers, farmers both within the different states and as international unions among themselves. In such a way there may come order instead of economic anarchy. The strength of such collective action may direct the investment of capital into channels socially useful, and save much of the human effort now wasted in needless competition. Still more, it may save the world from the follies of international war and thus approach Locke's ideal of a commonwealth "for the good of all mankind".

DOROTHY TURNER

PRIMITIVE RELIGION

[**Francis James, M. A.,** went to Nigeria as an educational missionary and for eighteen months he lived with and studied the primitive tribe of Isokos. He is now engaged in research work in Anthropology.

In this fascinating narrative the author gives one answer to the problem discussed last month in this journal (pp. 504–5)—how to handle the prevalence of witchcraft among African Negroes.

Let the reader note the close similarity between the beliefs of most civilized men and women and those of these "primitives". Both believe in "The Great Father" and "The Great Friend who lives in the Sky" and who appoints His own representatives on earth to minister to the needs of human souls, punishes human sins and rewards human charities. But—says our author, these "primitives" are more free from theft and adultery than Europeans. Moreover, their tribal government also seems to be superior to our democratic states; for, to them persons matter more than things, while our civilization consists of buying and selling things without any great concern for the welfare of persons.—EDS.]

Of recent years there has been a great deal of research on the origins of religion, in the hope of discovering how man first came to a belief in God. The results of this research, among the aborigines of Australia, among the Eskimos, among the Melanesian savages, among the Bushmen of Africa who were there before the negroes, are now available. As usual there is no full agreement among the scientists, but there is a great deal of support for the view that at the most primitive stage there is always to be found a simple belief in a Supreme Being. Usually this Supreme Being is thought of as living in the sky, as being the Creator, and as being one who punishes evils and rewards good. It is further held by some that the other manifestations of paganism such as animism, witchcraft, human sacrifice, etc., are actual derogations from this earlier purer monotheism.

Certainly in Africa which I know at first hand, the belief in a Supreme Being is strongly held. There is no tribe in Africa from which that belief is absent, and though a great deal of African culture and religion has spread by contacts and borrowing, the universal belief in this Supreme Being has probably been reached by African people by itself; the primitive would say it was revealed to his earliest fathers by God. How does the primitive conceive of this Supreme Being? In West Africa he is known to some tribes as "The Great Friend who lives in the Sky"; another tribe speaks of him as "The Great Father". Among all African peoples he is connected vaguely with the creation of the world, and with the phenomenon of life itself. The primitive is no theologian; he does not ponder over the existence and character of God, nor reduce his religious belief to a system. Questioned about God, the primitive says

God created the world, that all other gods derive their power from him, that he lives in the sky and reveals his anger by thunder and lightning, that he makes the crops to grow and women to bear children, and that he always punishes those who are evil and blesses those who are good. He is sexless, distant, unknowable.

The primitive idea of God is therefore vague, though very real. And since the primitive is a little afraid of this distant God and does not claim to understand or control him, he believes that God has placed other, nearer, more reachable gods in the world. I may be allowed to describe in brief the religion of the primitive tribe with which I lived, and this description will give essentials of religious belief and practice which will hold good with variations for most negro tribes.

Next in importance to the worship of God, who is worshipped by invocation each morning on rising and occasionally by sacrifice, is the strong belief in reincarnation. The African tribe consists of those who are alive in the spirit world as well as those alive on earth. Every child born becomes the earthly home of a departed spirit, and every time a man dies a spirit enters heaven. Hence the proverb "A birth on earth means a death in heaven, and a death on earth means a birth in heaven". Often I have heard a native say, pointing to a young lad: "There is my grandfather". This strong belief in reincarnation accounts for the African desire for children, and for polygamy as the means to secure them. When a man dies, there is not only the first burial to inter the body, but also the second and more important burial when a plantain tree trunk is buried with great ceremony, which is believed to ensure the entry of the spirit of the departed into heaven. Should the family of the deceased delay this second burial too long, the spirit of dead man will haunt his children and bring calamity to them, until the rites are performed. There is much that is good about this ancestor worship, and it strengthens tribal and family feeling, for each member of the tribe knows that the ancestors are watching over him and that he owes them a duty. For the same reason no native owns land in Africa, but only the use of the land, for it actually belongs to the whole tribe, living and dead. Similarly the remarkable obedience shewn to the tribal Elders is due to the fact that they are acting for the ancestors. The ancestors are worshipped every fourth day, and always on the occasion of a birth or a marriage.

Ancestor worship leads naturally to the worship of the founder of the clan. Of this I may give an instance. I was staying one day in the head village of a powerful clan; this clan had been founded by a native who came with his wives to that country in search of land some 200 years ago, and on seeing a feather floating down to his feet from the sky, it was taken as a sign that God wanted him

to settle there. In time his offspring grew into a large clan. But every year all the members of the clan met before the clan fetish, which consisted of four clay figures. One represented the founder of the clan, and stuck in his head was the actual feather which came to him as a sign; another was his head wife; another was a slave; and the fourth was a child. Before any woman of the clan can have a child, she must offer sacrifices to the founder of the clan, symbolised in the clay figure. On the day in question I saw a woman covered with white chalk walking through the village, and, following, I saw her enter, right away in the bush, a sacred grove. Upon seeking admission, I was refused, but after some time I was allowed to enter on condition that I sat silently in a corner. This I did readily enough, overjoyed to be in at the actual worship of the most powerful and secret fetish in the country. As it happened I was asked to leave very soon, as the priest said the clan founder was angry at my presence; but not before I had seen paganism at work. In front of the four huge clay figures, was a priest, a priestess, and several sub-priests, all coated with white chalk. Kneeling down was a woman, confessing her sins to the fetish and asking for a child. After her confession, the priest cast lots with broken kola-nuts, the sign of the founder's approval being the facing upwards of all the broken sides of the nuts. The sign was a refusal of the founder's approval. Seven times the woman confessed, the priest urging her to confess everything. At last he told her that the founder was angry because she was withholding something, whereupon the woman began to cry and to confess that she had become the priestess of another fetish. Once she had confessed everything, the nuts came down the right way, the priest said she should have a child, and the woman went away satisfied. That I think was a typical case of clan paganism; the native's belief is that the founder of the clan is in the spirit world, seeing all on earth and watching over his offspring, and he grants fertility in women to increase his clan, only to those who do good, confess all, and make their sacrifices to him.

In addition to the worship of the ancestors, and of the clan founder, there are innumerable spirits, represented by fetishes, which watch over farms, trees, ponds and rivers. Sacrifices are offered to these before work of any kind is undertaken, to ensure freedom from calamity, and to secure good fishing, hunting and farming.

But paganism is not merely a clan or tribal thing. In my tribe each individual has two special private fetishes, made of wood. One is supposed to represent the spirit which created that person, acting for God, and this spirit must be placated and served each day, if protection is needed. The other is the soul of the person, visibly represented in an object to be worshipped for if that soul is

not properly served by sacrifice to the fetish, the soul will leave the person and death results.

The primitive, then, with the fetishes of his creator, his soul, his farming, fishing and hunting spirits, his clan founder, his ancestors, and above all his Sky-God, to serve, has his life filled with religion. Indeed the primitive does nothing apart from religion. Every birth, marriage and death is vitally related to the ancestors, whose concern it obviously is. Every piece of work done is preceded by worship and sacrifice. Each day begins with an invocation to the Sky-God. The whole tribal, clan, and family life, is surrounded and interpenetrated by religion. And *of nearly all the expressions of primitive religion it may be said that they make for morality. The penalties for theft and adultery in a primitive tribe are so heavy, that primitive society is probably much freer from these two evils than European.*

But, what of evil? How does the primitive explain it? If God is beneficent, and ancestors wish well, what can one say if a man who serves his gods faithfully is rewarded by calamity? And here the phenomenon of witchcraft comes to the aid of the primitive. Should any one who has lived a good life suffer calamity such as poor crops or no children, this is believed to be the work of witches, and witches are hunted down and killed.

The belief in witchcraft is common to all primitive peoples. It is a belief which has only recently died in England, and it survived some 1200 years of Christianity here. The only cure for the superstition is rationalism, the objective study of natural causes, and this is utterly alien to the primitive. He does not distinguish between causes acting in nature and those acting in persons. In my tribe *e. g.* if twins are born, one is killed, since twins are deemed unnatural, and it would be treason to the tribe to allow a person who is the embodiment of evil to live. Similarly a death due to dysentery is said to be the work of a witch. Any infraction of the normal course of nature is believed to be the work of evil spirits actually resident in a person, and usually in an old barren woman. To kill such a person is thus highly praiseworthy, and witch-detecters are believed to be a social asset. Hence when the British Government protect witches who are anti-social and evil, and punish those who benefit society, the primitive African is utterly non-plussed. To him, witchcraft is a perfectly satisfactory answer to the problem of evil, and the remedy is plain.

Witchcraft, then, an evil and cruel superstition, and the killing of witches an abominable practice are both understandable once one sees them through native eyes. This does not mean they are to be tolerated; but quite certainly they will not be abolished by mere denunciation. And no account of primitive religion would be complete which ignored this important phenomenon.

Africa to-day is a continent in transition. Indeed every primitive people to-day is in transition. The "acids of modernity" brought to these simple peoples by Western secular scientific civilisation, are dissolving native society and breaking down tribal cohesion. In this process of destruction primitive religion is the first element to decay, for it is based on a non-rationalistic outlook, and it withers at the first touch of modern science. And though there is much that is cruel and evilly superstitious in paganism which ought to be abolished, there is also much that is valuable which ought to be preserved. First, is the unity of primitive life. *In Europe each activity of life, art, learning, industry, pleasure, and even religion, may be detached from the whole pattern of life, and a man may follow one activity to the exclusion of all the others. Not so in primitive life. Life to the primitive is a unity, it has a fixed pattern, and it is penetrated by religion.* No one activity may be pursued apart from religion. And this unifying influence of primitive religion is a powerful and good thing. Secondly, paganism inculcates loyalty to the group above loyalty to one's selfish desires. In African society the group is always more important than the individual and the group includes the ancestors as well as the living. Thus even marriage is never an affair of individuals or even of two families, but an affair of two clans and of the ancestors, and the social sanctions making for the permanence of the marriage contract are strong indeed. Thirdly, paganism exalts the value of human personality. In Western society things tend to matter more than individuals, and vast impersonal forces mould the lives of the mass of the people: *In Africa persons matter most, and things count only in so far as they are related to persons.* In the natural community of family, clan and tribe, character and personality are created, and it is the considered opinion of the leading German missionary philosophers that the African has more of the true meaning of life and of personality, than the individualistic Westerner.

It seems likely, then, that whereas in the past African heathenism has been regarded as a dark and evil thing to be utterly crushed out and supplanted, now, alongside this necessary work of destroying the evil in it, there must go this work of preserving those elements in primitive religion which are of great value, and which are lacking from much Western religion. Certain it is that the primitive has not lived in utter darkness and error all these centuries, waiting until the Anglo-Saxon race in its goodness could take them to the light of truth. And it may well be that the task of this century will be for the white man to get alongside the African, that each may learn from the other.

FRANCIS JAMES

THE MYSTICAL TEACHINGS OF AVICENNA

[**Dr. Margaret Smith, M. A.,** has familiarized our readers with the Theosophy of Persian Mystics through a series of articles in our last Volume. Recently she has published two new books *Attar* in "The Wisdom of the East" Series and *Studies in Early Mysticism.*

The following very interesting article shows once again how time and space make no difference to those who are able to see truth—always the same, universal and impersonal. Students of Theosophy will better appreciate this article by noting what H. P. Blavatsky has to say in her *Theosophical Glossary* :—

> "Avicenna was the latinized name of Abu-Ali al Hoséen ben Abdallah Ibn Sina; a Persian philosopher, born 980 A.D., though generally referred to as an Arabian doctor. On account of his surprising learning he was called "the Famous," and was the author of the best and the first alchemical works known in Europe. All the Spirits of the Elements were subject to him, so says the legend, and it further tells us that owing to his knowledge of the Elixir of Life, he still lives, as an adept who will disclose himself to the profane at the end of a certain cycle."]

Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā) belonged to the school of thinkers in Islam who were known as "The Philosophers," a title given to those who had made a special study of the Greek writers and, in particular, of the Neo-Platonists. This development of the study of philosophy within Islam had begun as early as the ninth century A.D. Abū Yusuf al-Kindī of Kūfa (ob. A.D. 860) became head of the first Muslim School of Philosophy at Baghdad, and he and his fellow-scholars were responsible for the translation of numerous Greek philosophic works, including the so-called "Theology of Aristotle" which was, in fact, Porphyry's Commentary on the "Enneads" of Plotinus. al-Kindī's work was continued by al-Fārābī (ob. A.D. 950), a Turk by origin, who studied at Baghdad and afterwards went to Syria, where he lived the life of a Ṣūfī giving his time to study and contemplation. Among his writings were treatises on "The Soul," and "The Faculties of the Soul," and "The One and the Unity". al-Fārābī makes use of language which is deeply mystical, and he was one of the first to adapt Greek philosophical terms for the use of Ṣūfism.

In the second half of the tenth century there was a further development of a theosophic doctrine within Islam, due to the rise of the "Brethren of Purity" (*Ikhwān al-Ṣafā*), a group of ascetics who were also philosophers, who set forth a system of spiritual philosophy, the aim of which was attainment to knowledge of the Godhead. Their great Encyclopædia consists of fifty tracts on every branch of philosophy and of these, eleven deal with Mysticism. They taught that the essence of man consisted in the soul, and that the goal of man's existence should be to live "with Socrates, devoted to the Intellect, and with Christ,

to the Law of Love". Further, they held that all nations had their contribution to make towards the ideal of ethical and moral perfection, and that the morally and spiritually perfect man should be "of East-Persian descent, an Arab in faith, Irāqī by education, a Hebrew in worldly wisdom, a disciple of Christ in conduct, as devout as a Syrian monk, a Greek in knowledge, an Indian in the interpretation of hidden things, but lastly, and above all, a Ṣūfī in his whole spiritual life".

Such were the forerunners of Avicenna, and it was into the heritage which they had left behind that he was able to enter, and it was on their teaching that he was able to base his own doctrines, which represented a fuller and more complete system of theosophy.

Abū 'Alī al-Ḥusayn Ibn 'Abd Allah Ibn Sīnā was born in A. D. 980 at Afshana near Bukhārā, of Persian parentage, and he proved to be one of the greatest and most original Persian thinkers of his time. He was known as "The Prince of Learning" or "The Chief of Teachers" (*al-Shaykh al-Rā'īs*). He received an excellent education in Islamic theology and jurisprudence, and also in geometry and astronomy, physics, logic and metaphysics, and he made a special study of the writings of the philosopher already mentioned, al-Fārābī. He also studied medicine under a Christian physician, 'Isā b. Yaḥyā, and mysticism with Ismā'īl the Ṣūfī. When still a youth, Avicenna had the good fortune to be successful in his medical treatment of Nuḥ b. Manṣūr, the sultan of Bukhārā, who gave the boy access to his valuable library, containing many unique volumes, and here Avicenna was able to gain much of the knowledge that enabled him to make so great a contribution to the learning of his day; he began to write when he was but twenty-one. He lived a somewhat wandering life, settling down for periods at different princely courts, and among these he appears to have spent a happy time at the court of Ma'mūn b. Ma'mūn, Prince of Khwārazm, but when this ruler's territories were annexed by Maḥmūd of Ghazna in A.D. 1017 Avicenna had to take flight. After being imprisoned by the Amir of Hamadān, Ibn Sīnā escaped and took refuge with the Buwayhid prince 'Alā al-Dawla, at Isfahān and there he enjoyed a period of tranquillity, giving most of his time to writing, while in the evening he used to hold meetings for the discussion of philosophic questions. He died at Hamadān in A.D. 1037.

Avicenna's writings include a treatise "On the Soul," a "Guide to Wisdom," and also a few poems in Persian. His earlier writings were mainly a development of Neo-Platonism, but towards the end of his life he drew up the outline of an Oriental Philosophy, representing his original ideas. Of this he actually wrote only two sections, on Logic and Mysticism, and the latter, "The Indications and Annotations" (*al-Ishārāt wa'l-*

Tanbīhāt), gives his development of the Ṣūfī doctrine, a doctrine based upon the Unity of all Being, in which Ibn Sīnā shews himself to be the forerunner of the later Ṣūfī mystics in their monistic teaching.

His conception of the Godhead is that of Absolute, Perfect Unity, the First One, the Sole Cause, Who alone is Necessary Being, Ineffable and Incomparable. From this Absolute Unity proceeds the World of Ideas, or the "World-Spirit," which also is not subject to multiplicity or change. Below this world is the World of Souls, the Essences which give life to bodies. Below this world again, are the worlds of the Active Intellect, and of material things. Matter is defined by Avicenna as contingent being, a passive possibility, and creation means the giving of actual existence to this contingent form of being. Evil exists only in what is contingent, and what appears to be evil is a good from some higher point of view. "It does not enter into the plan of the Divine Wisdom to abandon lasting and universal Good, because of fleeting evil in individual things."

God is the Supreme Beauty as He is Perfect Goodness, but Beauty, says Avicenna, is the veil of Beauty, and the outward appearance is linked with the inner reality, and so the manifestation of the Divine Glory serves to conceal the hidden mystery, as the sun, when a light cloud covers it, can be looked upon, but if it shines in all its splendour, it is invisible, being veiled by the excess of light. Yet this King manifests His glory to His creatures, He does not grudge to them the right to meet with Him, according to their capacity for approaching Him.*

In his teaching on the nature of the human soul, Avicenna holds that the Rational Soul, which controls the lower or carnal soul, and is itself enabled to penetrate to the mysteries of the higher realm, by the enlightenment given by the World-Spirit, is the real man, who has been brought into temporal existence, but is a pure Essence, a substance indestructible and therefore immortal. Life in the body, and the whole world of sense, serve as a means of training and purification for the soul. In his *Qaṣīda* on the Human Soul, Avicenna writes:

It descended upon thee from out of the regions above;
That exalted, ineffable, glorious, heavenly Dove.
'Twas concealed from the eyes of all those who its nature would ken
Yet it wears not a veil and is ever apparent to men.
Unwilling it sought thee and joined thee and yet, though it grieve,
It is like to be still more unwilling thy body to leave.
It resisted and struggled and would not be tamed in haste,
Yet it joined thee and slowly grew used to this desolate waste,
Till forgotten at length, as I ween, were its bounds and its troth
In the heavenly gardens and groves, which to leave it was loath.
Thick nets detain it, and strong is the cage whereby
It is held from seeking the lofty and spacious sky.
Until, when the hour of its homeward flight draws near,

* Risālat Ḥayy b. Yaqẓān. *Cf.* Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite, who writes of the "Divine Darkness, which is in truth Light Unapproachable, dark through excess of light".

And 'tis time for it to return to its ampler sphere,
It carols with joy, for the veil is raised and it spies
Such things as cannot be witnessed by waking eyes,
And so it returneth, aware of all hidden things
In the universe, while no stain to its garment clings.

The poet asks why it was cast down from on high to this drear abyss of earth, and himself suggests the answer:

Was it God Who cast it forth for some purpose wise,
Concealed from the keenest searcher's inquiring eyes?
Then is its descent a discipline wise but stern,
That the things that it hath not heard it thus may learn.
So 'tis she whom Fate doth plunder, until her star
Setteth at length in a place from it rising far,
Like a gleam of lightning, which over the meadows shone,
And, as though it ne'er had been, in a moment is gone.*

In his mystical treatise entitled "The Bird" (*Risālat al-Ṭayr*), Ibn Sīnā tells of the difficulties of the Way by which the soul seeks to ascend again to God, when it has cast off the fetters which bind it to the earthly and the material.

A band of hunters went out to catch birds, and after the nets had been spread, a number of birds fell into the snare, the author being represented as one of them. The birds suffered at first from their confinement in cages, but gradually became accustomed to it, until certain of them managed to escape and were able also to help their companions to freedom. Though still bearing the remnants of their chains, they took to flight, and while on their journey beheld eight high mountains; with great efforts, the birds surmounted the summits of all up to the last. When they reached the foot of the eighth mountain, they found that its peaks stretched up into the clouds of Heaven, and other birds were there who, after hearing the story of their tribulations, told them that beyond this mountain was the city where dwelt the Great King: every wretched one who took refuge there and entrusted himself to the King, was shielded by His power from all harm. So the travellers took heart, and directed their way to the city of the King, until at last they reached it and received permission to enter. They went in then to the Royal palace, and when they had passed through one spacious ante-chamber after another, at last the suppliants entered into the presence of the Great King. When the veil between Him and themselves was raised, and their eyes beheld Him in all His glory, the birds were filled with amazement and confusion at that sight, and they could not make their complaint but the King, by His kindness, re-assured them, and sent them back to those who had oppressed them, with the command that the chains they still bore should be removed.

On the return journey the birds begged their brother (the author) to give them his impression of the King, and he said:

He is that One in Whom is united all imaginable Beauty, wherein nothing unlovely is found, and Supreme Perfection, wherein nothing is lacking. In

* I quote Prof. E. G. Browne's translation.

His Face is found all beauty, and in His hand all kindness. That one who serves Him faithfully will obtain the highest joy, but he who deserts Him will be lost in this world and the next.*

Elsewhere Ibn Sīnā teaches that pure souls, which are filled with a desire for perfection, can attain to the perfect fulfilment of that which they so ardently desire, even in this life, and to the beatitude of the celestial world hereafter. If we concern ourselves with material things and do not long after the Divine Light, the cause lies in ourselves, not in the Supreme Perfection, which is continuously manifested forth to those who have eyes to see and the will to seek. Those who are weak of will or deficient in intelligence will either attain to a state of happiness fitted to their capacity, or it may be that they will be granted another body suitable to their condition, and may thereby attain in the end to the degree of the spiritually perfect.† So Avicenna accepts the possibility of re-incarnation for those who cannot attain to perfection in this life, though he expressly rules out the possibility of transmigration of the human soul into animal bodies.

It is by Love that the soul can become fit to receive the revelation of the Absolute, which in its highest degree means that which the Ṣūfīs call Union. Avicenna asserts that as all created beings have within them a natural desire for the perfection which secures their well-being, every means to such perfection is loved as the source whence this well-being is derived. Now the most perfect object of such love is the First Cause of all creation, Who is the Beloved of all His creatures, to whom He has revealed His glory. If His Essence was hidden from them, they could have no knowledge of Him, but on the contrary, the Absolute does manifest His Essential nature to His creatures, and is not hidden save to those who have veiled themselves by the veil of weakness and defect.‡

Therefore the soul which is filled with desire for perfection and love towards that Divine Being in union with Whom perfection is to be attained can go onwards and upwards until its goal is reached.

Avicenna, in dealing with the Path by which the soul can attain to union with the Divine, says that there are three types of religious aspirants:

(*a*) The ascetic (*zāhid*), who renounces all connection with this world.

(*b*) The devotee (*'ābid*) who observes with rigour the exterior requirements of religion.

(*c*) The gnostic (*'ārif*) who gives himself up wholly to meditation upon the Kingdom of God, seeking therefrom the illumination of his soul by the Divine Light.

It is the gnostic alone who seeks to bring the senses and the imagination under control, to detach himself from all the vanities of this present world, and thus to attain to the Divine Reality. So will he find that his inmost self is open to receive the Divine revelation, and illumination from on high, and he will be empowered, when his soul so wills, to raise himself to the Light of God, free from the distraction of worldly concerns, yea, bidding farewell to all these, until all within him will have become sanctified. This alone is the true gnostic, who knows no other object of adoration than the Divine Being, and who is moved neither by hope of recompense nor by fear of punishment, for his eyes are fixed upon God alone.

There are stages and degrees in the contemplative life, to which the gnostics alone attain in this world.

The first stage for the gnostic is that called "Will," the stage of Right Intention. Through this, the one who is convinced of the Supreme Truth will discipline his soul in directing it towards God, with the ultimate hope of attaining to union with Him. While this stage continues, he is called the "aspirant" (*murīd*).

The second stage is that of self-discipline, with the three-fold aim of removing all save God from his path, of subordinating the carnal soul to the rational soul so that the imagination and intellect shall be attracted to the higher, and not to the lower, and of making the conscience sensitive to admonition.

The third stage is that of the entire surrender of the soul, now freed from the distraction of sensual desires, to the spiritual love which seeks to be dominated by the qualities of the Beloved. Now to the initiate appear flashes of the Divine Light, and moments of mystic joy, brief as lightning gleams, which pass away again. These are known to those who experience them as the mystic "states," and according to the mystic's capacity to receive them they become more and more frequent.

In the fourth stage the mystic has no longer need of self-discipline in order to receive the Divine illumination, but wherever he looks he beholds the image of God. It may be that he is bewildered by his experiences, but as he becomes accustomed to the Light given him, he attains to a state of perfect tranquillity. Thence he passes into the fifth stage, when God's Presence is continually with him (*sakīna*) and the transient flash is transformed into a shining flame, and he attains to that direct knowledge of God, which means that he will henceforth walk continuously with Him.

Then he arrives at the sixth stage, when he contemplates God in himself, and being carried outside of himself, though he appears to be present, yet in truth he is absent, and now the mystic experience becomes easy to him, so that it comes to him when he desires it. After having passed through this stage, he finds that

* The great Persian mystical poet 'Aṭṭār makes this allegory the basis of his famous poem *Mantiq al-Ṭayr* (The Discourse of the Birds).

† *Fī'l-Bahjat wa'l-Sa'āda* (Types of Enjoyment and Happiness).

‡ *Fī'l-'Ishq* (Treatise on Love).

it no longer depends even upon his will, but in all that he looks upon, he sees only God, and so he can turn aside from this transient world and ascend into the world of Reality, and this is the seventh stage.*

Thence he passes from striving to attainment, and in the eighth stage his inmost self becomes as a polished mirror wherein is reflected the Face of God, and the highest of joys will take possession of him, he will rejoice in his own soul, since in contemplating it, he contemplates God therein.

Then in the ninth and final stage the mystic passes away from himself and contemplates the Divine Majesty alone, and if he regards himself, it is only as that which contemplates. Now he has arrived at complete union with God.†

Yet the gnostic, though now living the unitive life in God, is not unmindful of his fellow-creatures. Before he entered into that union with the Divine, he could not endure any distraction by worldly things but now he is protected from all disturbance, and he is able to take a fresh interest in the world around him, and to feel a Divine compassion towards all God's creatures. He willingly forgives to others the wrong they do to him, and bears no malice, for his soul, being purified from sin, concerns itself only with God.

It is clear that Avicenna was deeply versed in Neo-Platonism and profoundly influenced by the teaching of Plotinus, yet he is one of the most original of the earlier Persian philosophers and mystics, and his theosophical doctrine combines Aristotelian and Neo-Platonic theories with Persian mysticism, and perhaps, too, with ideas derived from Buddhism. His writings‡ have had a far-reaching influence in both East and West, and that influence has been exercised not only on Ṣūfism within Islam, but also on Christian Scholasticism.

MARGARET SMITH

* *Cf.* Plotinus "When the phantasm has returned to the Original, the journey is achieved. Suppose him to fall again from the Vision, he will call up the virtue within him and seeing himself all glorious again, he will take his upward flight once more, through virtue to the Divine Mind, through the Wisdom there, to the Supreme." Ennead VI. 11 tr. Mackenna.

† *Fī maqāmāt al-'ārifīn* (Stages of the Contemplative Life).

‡ The Arabic text of Avicenna's Mystical Treatises has been edited by M. A. F. Mehren (Leyden 1889) and the text of the "Ishārāt wa'l-Tanbīhāt" by J. Forget (Leyden 1892). For accounts of Avicenna's life and teaching *cf.* de Boer "History of Philosophy in Islam," and Carra de Vaux, "Penseurs de l'Islam" IV.

THE CYCLE OF THE SENSES

[**Helen Bryant** is known to our readers by two articles ; " What Makes a City's Personality," and "The Reincarnation of Cities". In the following contribution she shows one phase of universal law of Cycles.—EDS.]

Man's senses are the addicts of repetition. They worship pattern: they are never so happy as when finding it repeated—in sound, in colour, in movement. We love to trace the orderliness of reiteration in the most wayward things—in the arrant wind that bows a cornfield in wave after rhythmic wave, in the sea that beats back and forth in its obedient tides, in the ironbound accuracy of hurtling planets, the geometric perfection of crystals, the cyclic pattern visible even in the vagaries of man's history. Our reaction to this order is a feeling of satisfaction: We are tranquillized by repetition, and entranced with it. For it is very rare that we fully perceive the perfection of a great pattern at the first contact: be it a symphony or a solar system, a song or a philosophy: our first impression is necessarily sketchy—our senses are so still, so insensitive ! Only at the third or fourth encounter—when we are beginning to *await the expected*—do we have any thing like a complete joy of it. Then, the *recognition* of the recurring pattern and its kinship with other patterns, sharpens the ecstasy. Not variety, but familiarity, is the spice of life.

Why should this be ? Why do we cry out for arrangement of life in cycles, and for the intricate interlocking of these cycles, so that, interdependent upon each other, they must return ?

Ah, that may be the solution. They must return—and, returning, seem proof to us of the logic of our desperate desire for eternity. With each repetition comes a little deeper certainty, fresh fuel for our eager hope. So that we treasure it, hold out our hands to it, warming our faith—so susceptible to the cold breath of doubt and fear. Each spring following spring, each atom returning irrevocably upon its beaten path, each city that renews itself, each civilisation that rises and declines, each re-discovered "discovery," each repeated art, is a balm to our senses and so to our souls. Recognising each isolated fragment as part of an infinite and eternal whole, we reconstruct that whole —or try to, and, seeing ourselves as infinitesimal but actual parts of it, are soothed and re-assured.

But the senses themselves—these discerning and codifying things—what of them ? Are they not part, too, of the whole, subject themselves to the cycle of change and recurrence and, for that very reason, in some eras more able than in others to perceive, to document, to reconstruct ? Perhaps civilisations are the mere outward evidences of some far deeper and simpler

rhythm in the senses of man. *Perhaps, at this moment, there is a sense at so low an ebb that we are practically unconscious of its existence.* Our senses of sight and sound are so over-exercised to-day, fed with such insistence and indiscrimination that a more delicate sense might well be lost through pure starvation—lack of meditation, simplicity, repose. Only in far lost corners of silence and tranquillity may it be found, so that, when we stumble across it, we deny it, call it quackery or fanaticism, or at best, illusion.

An illogical denial. For we are willing enough to believe in the existence of things which evade detection by our senses but not our machines. Quite gleefully we claim the existence of sounds we cannot hear, colours we cannot see. Perhaps once there were men who *could* see those colours, hear those sounds: and perhaps there will be such men again. Even in our own time the sense of sight and hearing are in constant flux. To-day the sense of sight is supreme, but its supremacy is very, very recent! To-day the eyes bear—very competently, in spite of the parrot cries about deteriorating eyesight!—a tremendous burden. For seventeen or eighteen hours out of twenty-four they stand a strain no jungle hunter ever imposed upon *his* eye-balls! Hours of perceiving and transferring to the brain the significance of millions of tiny black slugs printed closely together, hours of being battered by streams of light, sometimes steady, sometimes glaring, sometimes flickering—and, almost with every day, fresh demands. Perhaps the word should not be supremacy, but slavery. . . .

Be that as it may, such a state of affairs did not exist before the days of photography, of printing, of illustrating, above all, of artificial light. Further back still, and it was to the ears rather than to the eyes that our ancestors trusted even for their safety. Nowadays, the responsibility of self-preservation devolves upon the latter, which must dart hither and yon, watching traffic and traffic lights, edges of railway platforms, and the sudden appearance of obstacles upon roads. Our warning shout is no longer "Hist!" but "Look out!"

But the wheel turns, and already the supremacy of the eyes is being challenged. With the advent of the radio the sense of hearing is taking possession of a vast new kingdom. Already we hear our politics instead of reading them: listen to our operas instead of seeing them, and to lectures while our text-books stay unopened on their shelves. Is the day approaching when we shall find it so much easier to listen that we shall cease to look?

Or will some stranger sense appear, coming again among us because its time is ripe, its cycle achieved? Men are thinking deeply to-day, struggling to understand the pattern and substance of this cloth of existence in which the frail threads of their own egos are woven, and, to a few of them, sometimes, there comes, like a subtle fragrance, a foretaste of an unnameable awareness. . . Humanity is the marriage of sense and spirit made manifest. Such a marriage may well have had—and have again—some liason agent, some connecting spiritual tissue far more perfect than any or all of our five physical senses. There are indications that such a "tissue" or sixth sense can be fostered by fasting and denial of the other senses. Our present civilisation is unwilling to do this: it is very heavily weighed down with the luxuries of a machine age. Yet perhaps that does not matter: perhaps, like a sun below the horizon, the lost sense but waits its proper time to return and bring a flowering, a summer in the spirit and the blood. . . .

HELEN BRYANT

"The Present is the Child of the Past; the Future, the begotten of the Present. And yet, O present moment! Knowest thou not that thou hast no parent, nor canst thou have a child; that thou art ever begetting but thyself? Before thou hast even begun to say 'I am the progeny of the departed moment, the child of the past,' thou hast become that past itself. Before thou utterest the last syllable, behold! thou art no more the Present but verily that Future. Thus, are the Past, the Present, and the Future, the ever-living trinity in one—the Mahamaya of the Absolute IS."

H. P. BLAVATSKY (*The Secret Doctrine* II, p. 446)

WHAT DOES DEATH MEAN TO YOU?

II.—THE INADEQUACY OF RATIONALISM

[**Max Plowman** continues his meditation on Death and Sorrow and interestingly analyses the rite of mourning. He distinguishes between facts of sense perception and Reality visioned by imagination which latter must be used to understand the meaning of death.—EDS.]

In a previous article I endeavoured to show that an impersonal attitude to death could only be maintained if we abstracted the idea from experience and treated the affections of the heart as matter for pure reason. I contended that what is thought to be a realistic or scientific attitude was an intellectual pose and could not be adopted save by a misunderstanding of the province of science, since death has no objective existence and is, for human beings, without meaning except as subjective experience. I now want to show that the prevailing indifference to subjective experience is due to a mistaken belief in the validity of objective truth—a belief fostered by our natural disinclination to face painful reality.

Indifference to death is now professed everywhere. It is a commonplace of our literature. It is apparent in our customs. The show of mourning for the dead has come to be regarded in England as slightly vulgar, to be condoned only among the poor and ignorant. Mourning of any kind is, socially speaking, *de trop*. Unwanted are those who mourn, for they are a social nuisance. Blank unmeaning ignorance is generally felt to be the unhappy but unavoidable portion of the bereaved, and it is unattractive. We wish to be kind to the bereaved, for they have suffered misfortune; but we do not expect to be called upon to share their grief, for, in our view, that is to make bad worse.

Professed ignorance in the face of death has now taken the place of religious belief. This ignorance, hardening into a negative dogma by means of the acceptance of scientific fact, declares that the destiny of the individual at death cannot certainly be known, but that all probability points to extinction; and this "probable" of science has become a sort of standard of intellectual integrity: "the best minds" of the day say "probably," and intellectual snobbery accepts the "probable" as dogmatic. Hence the decay of mourning which, if carefully traced, can be shown to have proceeded all through the last half century, step by step in precise exactness with the growing acceptance of purely rational ideas. And if we believe the dead at death are extinct, then mourning has lost its historic *raison d'être* and becomes a survival, necessarily insincere. But this thought is

too rigorous for our vague sentiment: we prefer to say that we curtail the signs of mourning out of respect for the feelings of the dead, who, because they loved life, would have hated to depress it.

The speciousness of such an argument is obvious; for a lover never yet was found whose love could be abated by thought of the beloved. It is not the dead who decree the measure of our love. "No mourning by request" is a bequest beyond the power of probate, because the love that expresses itself in mourning can no more be abated than it can be created by request. But if we believe that the dead are really extinct, then the sooner we turn from the thought of them the better; for life is short, and if the death of our most beloved is just an interruption in the business of life, clearly it is our duty to make it as short an interruption as possible.

This, in point of fact, is just what happens. I do not say that most people believe in individual extinction, though the belief is common; but what is painfully clear is that most people are at heart so bewildered by the thought of death that they turn from it as useless and distressing. Evasion thus becomes a habit of thought, so that when death touches them closely, their only hope is to run away, even though this running away means a denial of the heart. Practised evasion has totally disarmed them, so that at sight of death they flee from him, taking refuge in the distractions of existence, persuading themselves that it is their sense of reality which tells them that life, and not death, is important. But they escape at the price of a terrible insincerity, the insincerity of denying the powerful heart out of respect for the impotent intellect. And the penalty for this insincerity is fundamental disintegration: it really means the harbouring of fear until fear turns death into a secret and perpetual menace, threatening to every living relationship: it means a gradual hardening of the heart, a steeling of the will, in order to achieve a loveless self-sufficiency, and finally a mistrust of anything but the most obvious sense-pleasures. The Queen in *Hamlet* is a perfect example of this decline.

Indifference may well denote spiritual atrophy even when it is our own death that has to be faced. I myself have seen the very apotheosis of this attitude. Fifteen years ago I saw it embodied in the lives of English youths who, at that time, were daily facing death in fighting aeroplanes. And never have I seen death look so small: it became quite literally a trifling matter, by habit of thought not to be thought of. But admirable and heroic as it is to set one's life at less than a pin's fee in the cause of honour so "the readiness is all," what ghastly superficiality is it that would hold a trifling view of life for the sake of an easy exit by the way of death? For small as death looked in the eyes of those young men, life looked even

smaller—a thing of such gross and empty pleasures as to be contemptible. Written across their faces was the tragic finding of Macbeth: "Life's but a walking shadow." Like him they had attained indifference, like him they had drunk the cup to the lees; like his their indifference was the indifference of desperation—of men to whom Fate was an implacable enemy, and Destiny the certainty of defeat.

The rationalist attitude shown by indifference to death is to be rejected not because it is unsound but because it is atavistic and implies the return to a form of blind animal consciousness man had already surpassed thousands of years ago. It betrays its atavism in the fact that it always leads to cynicism; for man cannot return upon himself without self-scorn: he cannot deny his own consciousness without that form of spiritual suffering which shows itself in contempt. The determining factor of human consciousness in the past was that it took the love line, and by adventuring along the path of its extended sympathies entered upon a world unknown to animal consciousness. It is therefore useless to point to animal consciousness as if it contained the basic truth of human consciousness; and whenever science goes out of its way to do this, it is, in the strict sense of the words, corrupting and beastly. Its realism is partial, insufficient and misleading. True realism must face the entire sentient man.

What then shall we do who reject the way of rationalism as having no answer to our question? Where shall we turn who have discovered that the world of science is a little bounded world wholly contained within the world of religion? Shall we fly to orthodoxy and deliberately pretend that the graven monuments of dogma are identical with the warm breathing forms of faith? Recognising the insufficiency of the intellect, shall we fly in the face of intelligence and accept a *credo quia impossibile*? What shall we do who, by reason of the fact that we have loved with all our life, are precluded from taking the path of slowly hardening indifference? Of the love that has called us beyond mortal life, shall we make a religious effigy which denies the identity of the object of our love?

Shakespeare has put into the mouth of a murderer the reply of rationalism to those who mourn:

> For what we know must be, and is
> as common
> As any the most vulgar thing to sense,
> Why should we in our peevish opposition
> Take it to heart? Fie! 'tis a fault to heaven,
> A fault against the dead, a fault to nature,
> To reason most absurd . . .

and the only reasonable answer we can make to this is that it is completely wide off the mark in offering doctrinally to show why what *is* ought not to be. The King's homily is an echo of the Queen's, "Why seems it so particular to thee?" to which Hamlet so adequately replies, "Seems, madam! nay it is. I know not 'seems'". What shall we do, to whom the imperative present "is" of loss is not convertible into the past of "was," which is the change heart-hardening indifference would make? Are we really content to allow the identity of a beloved individual to pass from the particular consciousness of a beauty all its own, into the general consciousness of oneness with nature or mergence in the primal unity from which it sprang?

Belief in immortality has been called the pathetic fallacy, and thus likened to that so-called figure of speech by which the poets of all ages have given to natural objects the attributes of their own imaginations. Now if indeed this process be what it seems to the prosaic mind—nothing but a turn of metaphor artfully wrought to enliven the sympathy and produce in the reader willing suspension of disbelief—then poetry is what the purely rational mind believes it to be: a form of deceit engendered by the adornment of untruth which is decked with imagery so pleasing to the senses that they are indulged at the expense of the truth-loving mind. But such an idea is destructive of the very unity upon which the conception of truth depends: it can only be held by those who have mean and partial conceptions of truth and have made a virtue of their own shortcoming.

Let us take an example. When day dawns, the simplest expression of that fact is contained in the words "day dawns". Science can add to this simple statement a description of the event: it describes the revolution of the earth in relation to the sun and is thus an enlargement of the original statement, being an account of the process by which the event occurs: it determines the facts and thus increases knowledge of the event. But the truth is still unborn in the individual consciousness, because the emotions, which are as essential to man as the mind, are untouched by either statement: the reality is not presented either by the plain statement of fact, or by a description of the process. But when Shakespeare says:

> But look, the morn in russet mantle clad
> Walks o'er the dew of yon high eastern hill

he states the truth in its living reality. And how has he done this? He has created an image whereby the event is immediately present to the mind's eye and the responsive senses; and he has done this by departing completely from the terms of fact to the terms of imagination. The important point to note is that although he has made a complete severance from fact, he has told the truth *in a measure* unattainable to the most accurate statement that could be made of all the relevant facts. His truth is therefore greater than the truth of fact, not subject to fact but, on the contrary, comprehensive of fact and additional to it. By mirroring the truth in his own imagination he has surpassed the facts and presented the reality.

Now nothing but a misuse of the rational mind can describe such a gift of consciousness as pathetic fallacy; it is pathetic

fallacy only to those who mistrust their imagination. But the poetic statement can only be appraised by those who have, in some degree, the faculty that was employed in its making, and here the rationalist defaults. The poetic statement appeals to a higher level of consciousness than the rationalist concedes; but the incontrovertible fact about that consciousness is that it is the distinctively human consciousness. Not by the willing suspension of anything can we appreciate the poetic statement, but only by the activity of the imagination, which is the creative power of faith. The poetic statement represents the progression of the mind from the rational level to the higher imaginative level, and not (as the rationalist would have us believe) a regression from the real to the fanciful. It supplies to consciousness those elements of the whole truth which were lacking in the statement of rational truth. It shows a synthesis of the powers of human understanding which any lesser statement cannot achieve.

What is our conclusion from this? We conclude that truth itself is pathetic fallacy to those who have not the energy of faith, or the power of imagination. We see that what has been described as pathetic fallacy so far from being fallacious, is beyond the whole realm of fact, and—what is more important—we see that reality belongs to the same region, that ***reality has being in complete independence of fact.*** Reality is what we are in search of, so we shall have need to remember that it is only to be comprehended by the statement of poetic truth; also, that the apprehension of reality does not imply disharmony between truth and fact but only intensification of the power by which they are perceived.

This intensification is indeed the creative process by which man not only becomes aware of truth that cannot be comprised by fact, but by which he bodies forth express likenesses of the truth in images that are irresistible to consciousness. For truth meets with acceptance, not by ratiocination, but by that response of the whole organism which is pure recognition. It is this recognition that is commonly called vision.

William Blake, the English mystic, said: "Everything possible to be believed is an image of truth." What did he mean by that profound statement? Certainly not that every idle fancy of a lunatic is true. If we would understand him I think we must find out what he means by belief, for clearly he does not regard everything as possible of belief. Fancy, in this sense, cannot be believed: unlike imagination, it does require the willing suspension of disbelief. Fancy is essentially lacking in that intensification which is the concomitant of imagination: it is the sport of the mind, and neither springs from the sense of objective truth, nor moves toward it; it is incapable of the strong persuasion of belief. Imagination, on the other hand, is the drawing together of every conscious and unconscious faculty in the formation of a concept which, when formed, will be an express image of that portion of reality which was propagative in the mind; for the creative process of the imagination calls upon all the faculties to act at the fullest extent of their capacity, and this united action can only be brought about by the entire self-committal which is belief. When all the faculties are thus both aware and active, the impress upon them and the expression they take will be of truth. *If* we can believe anything, then what we believe will be an image of truth.

Belief in immortality is either a projection of man's creative imagination, or the play of his idle fancy. The measure of truth we can apprehend is according to the degree of belief: a conclusion which calls to mind the words, "According to your faith be it unto you".

MAX PLOWMAN

The following from *The Theosophical Glossary* of H. P. Blavatsky explain her statement that "There are two kinds of magnetization; the first is purely *animal*, the other transcendent, and depending on the will and knowledge of the mesmerizer, as well as on the degree of spirituality of the subject, and his capacity to receive the impressions of the astral light." (*Isis Unveiled* I. 178) (See the article which follows.)

HYPNOTISM (*Gr.*): A name given by Dr. Braid to various processes by which one person of strong will-power plunges another of weaker mind into a kind of trance; once in such a state the latter will do anything ***suggested*** to him by the hypnotiser. Unless produced for beneficial purposes, Occultists would call it ***black magic*** or Sorcery. It is the most dangerous of practices, morally and physically, as it interferes with the nerve fluid and the nerves controlling the circulation in the capillary blood-vessels.

MAGNETISM: A Force in nature and in man. When it is the former, it is an agent which gives rise to the various phenomena of attraction, of polarity, etc. When the latter, it becomes "animal" magnetism, in contradistinction to cosmic, and terrestrial magnetism.

ANIMAL MAGNETISM: While official science calls it a "supposed" agent, and utterly rejects its actuality, the teeming millions of antiquity and of the now living Asiatic nations, Occultists, Theosophists, Spiritualists, and Mystics of every kind and description proclaim it as a well established fact. Animal magnetism is *a fluid*, an emanation. Some people can emit it for curative purposes through their eyes and the tips of their fingers, while the rest of all creatures, mankind, animals and even every inanimate object, emanate it either as an *aura*, or a varying light, and that whether consciously or not. When acted upon by contact with a patient or by the will of a human operator, it is called "Mesmerism".

THE STORY OF HYPNOTISM

[**Dr. H. J. Strutton** who writes this interesting article is the Editor of *The Occult Review*. To facilitate his study the reader's attention is drawn to some extracts on the preceding page.—EDS.]

Of the many scientific terms in common use to-day, none, perhaps, is more loosely applied than the term "hypnotism". It is used to cover not only the accepted phenomena of suggestion, but every conceivable type of mental mastery of others, from fascination to domination. Between "hypnotism" and "mesmerism" no distinction whatever is drawn in popular usage; although, between the two states, a profound difference exists, however closely the physical phenomena may resemble each other superficially.

Although the word "mesmerism" has its origin in its association with the name of the famous practitioner of the art in the eighteenth century, it is to Paracelsus that should be awarded the honour of having first rediscovered and introduced the practice of what was then known as "magnetism". The adoption of the prefix "animal" came later, with the work of Mesmer.

In proof of the contention that Paracelsus *rediscovered* rather than originated the art of magnetism, may be adduced the fact that "thousands of years ago the Phrygian Dactyls, the initiated priests, spoken of as the 'magicians and exorcists of sickness,' healed diseases by magnetic processes. It was claimed that they had obtained these curative powers from the powerful breath of Cybele, the many-breasted goddess".

This quotation is from a valuable article by H. P. Blavatsky, entitled *Hypnotism: Black Magic in Science*, which appeared in *Lucifer* for June 1890. A reprint is now available as No. 19 of the U. L. T. Pamphlet Series, obtainable from the publishers of this magazine.

Mesmerism is characterized by Madame Blavatsky in her own quaint terminology as "antediluvian". "The blossoms of magic, whether white or black, divine or infernal," she says, "spring all from one root. The 'breath of Cybele'—Akâsa tattwa . . ." The scientists of Mesmer's day, had they but realized the fact, were offered a key which would have unlocked some of the deepest mysteries of the human constitution. In view of the subsequent trend of events, it is perhaps fortunate that orthodox science failed to grasp to the full the significance of the phenomena of Mesmerism.

As stated above, between the Mesmerism of the early practitioners and the hypnotism of more recent times, a wide gulf exists. While the theory and practice of the Mesmerists are based upon the recognition of the

existence of a direct vital transmission, such a possibility is denied by the practitioner of the purely hypnotic school. While the one, legitimately employed, may prove of tremendous value in the cure of disease, the other is definitely open to criticism. Indeed, in the article already quoted, H. P. B. goes so far as to declare that the "one (Mesmerism) is beneficent, the other (hypnotism) maleficent, as it evidently must be; since, according to both Occultism and modern Psychology, *hypnotism is produced by the withdrawal of the nervous fluid from the capillary nerves*, which being, so to say, the sentries that keep the doors of our senses opened, getting *ancesthesized* under hypnotic conditions, allow these to get closed". Madame Blavatsky then proceeds to endorse the views of the French Mesmerist, A.H. Simonin, when he maintains that while, under hypnotism, it is merely the lower, animal instincts which are primarily involved, under the influence of Mesmerism or Magnetism, "there occurs in the *subject* a great development of moral faculties". The possibilities of the true magnetic sleep, in fact, are such that the late Mrs. Attwood, in her remarkable work, *A Suggestive Inquiry into the Hermetic Mystery*, seems to have drawn very near to the discovery of its use in the process of initiation into the Mysteries.

The point of divergence in theory and practice between the Mesmerists and hypnotists may be traced to the fateful Commission appointed by the French government in 1784, which included among its members the famous Benjamin Franklin. These investigators decided that the effects produced by Mesmer were all the work of imagination! Thenceforward two definite streams of development may be traced. On the one hand may be found the practitioners of the true occult art—de Puységur, du Potet, Deleuze, Dr. Elliotson, Dr. Esdaile, Boirac, and so on; and on the other Braid, Bertrand, Liébault, Bernheim, Charcot, Heidenhain and Moll, all representative of what may be termed the "suggestion" school.

Modern hypnotism may be said to date from the time of James Braid who, in 1841, began his investigations into the practice of Mesmerism. As a result of his researches he threw aside many of the current magnetic theories. He found that hypnosis could be induced by fixed gazing and kindred physical means, and, most significant of all, by direct verbal suggestion.

Adherents of the suggestion theory are, perhaps naturally, prone to regard the methods of the Mesmerist as being, after all, merely suggestive in their *modus operandi*. The present writer, despite many years' intimate association with a Mesmerist of high order, was formerly inclined to the view that "suggestion" explained everything. An incident was witnessed, however, which left no room for doubt as to the

actuality of the Mesmeric or magnetic stream.

A Mesmeric sensitive, still in the waking state, and in the absence of the Mesmerist himself, was invited to go into a room by a door over which, unknown to the subject, passes had been made with the intention that he should *not* enter. Yet–he entered! Under the pretext of hanging up his hat in the hall, the subject was induced to retrace his steps, in order to give the experiment another trial. He turned, and found that an invisible force barred his exit through the doorway! It was subsequently noted that the passes had inadvertently been made from without, *inwards*. The subject could go with the stream, but not against it, despite intention, or possible telepathic suggestion.

Under the guise of magnetic healers, Mesmerism has never, from the time of Mesmer to the present day, been without its faithful followers; and it is not without interest, in this connection, to note that the *Journal du Magnetisme*, founded by du Potet in 1845 is still in existence, under the editorship of Monsieur Henri Durville.

Many remarkable cures are to the credit of mesmeric or magnetic healing, from the production of drugless anaesthesia, under which even major surgical operations have been painlessly performed, to the revitalization and restoration of the function of limbs atrophied through disuse from paralysis or kindred causes. Great as its value has undoubtedly proved to be when legitimately used by the healthy and pure-minded operator, even this is not without its dangers, since it is possible for the Mesmerist suffering from any physical or moral complaint, unconsciously to infect his subject with his own trouble.

It will be noted here that the stress is laid upon the direct transmission of the vital magnetic fluid. Suggestion plays a negligible part, and may even be entirely absent, though sometimes the two methods are intermixed.

If, then, there is danger from the use of the purely magnetic method, what shall be said of the promiscuous use of "suggestion," whether alone or in conjunction with the Mesmeric process? As hinted by H. P. B. above, suggestion acts only on the *lower* animal instincts. The tendency of its use is to weaken the link between the higher and the lower. No amount of induced suggestion can take the place of the action of the higher self upon the personality in the elimination of weaknesses and defects of the lower nature. Moral fibre, like muscular strength, is only to be obtained through exercise. The task of self-mastery by the will must sooner or later be taken in hand by the man himself. To resort to "short cuts" which promise quick results is not only to defer the day of reckoning, but actually to complicate matters karmically.

The evil of the spread of hypnotism and suggestion, unfortunately, does not end here. The art of suggestion has in recent times been brought to such a high state of efficiency that it is becoming a positive menace to humanity. For it is through subtle methods of suggestion that the "mass mind" is moulded according to the secret dictates of wire-pullers. Close observation will reveal to what an alarming extent the public mind is bombarded with deliberate suggestions made for commercial, political and other purposes by those who would secretly and selfishly exploit their fellow men.

Another development springing from the methods of the hypnotists which is open to criticism is that of psycho-analysis. As generally practised this serves to unlock what H. P. B. refers to as "those secret drawers, dark nooks and hiding places in the labyrinth of our memory" which are better left closed and not interfered with by outside influence, until such time as the ego himself decides to open them. Like hypnotism, psycho-analysis abrogates the higher powers in man, and on that score alone is morally indefensible.

A whole volume could be written on the developments of hypnotism and suggestion, and the menace of their future growth. Meanwhile, the clue to the mysteries of initiation into higher state of consciousness which there is strong reason to believe is hidden in age-old science of what is now called Mesmerism, lies neglected except by the few. One can only lament the tendencies of the day, and close with stern warning uttered by H. P. B. at the close of the notable essay which has been so freely quoted in this article.

> Experiments in "suggestion" by persons ignorant of the occult laws, are the most dangerous of pastimes. The action and reaction of ideas on the *inner lower* "Ego," has never been studied so far, because that Ego itself is *terra incognita* (even when not denied) to the men of science. Moreover, such performances before a promiscuous public are a danger in themselves. Men of undeniable scientific education who experiment on Hypnotism in public, lend thereby the sanction of their names to such performances. And then every unworthy speculator acute enough to understand the process may, by developing by practice and perseverance the same force in himself, apply it to his own selfish, often criminal, ends. *Result on Karmic lines*: every Hypnotist, every man of Science, however well-meaning and honourable, once he has allowed himself to become the unconscious instructor of one who learns but to abuse the sacred science, becomes, of course, morally the confederate of every crime committed by this means.

H. J. STRUTTON

DETERMINISM AND FREE WILL

[**J. D. Beresford** continues the study of the fascinating subject of fate and free-will commenced by Prof. C. E. M. Joad in our May issue and on which Prof. G. R. Malkani wrote in our June number.—EDS.]

In the course of the few thousand years of which we have fairly exact historical knowledge, man's subjection to a belief in Fate as a determining influence on individual life has played a curious and interesting part. The belief entered very early into religion. Primitive man if we can judge him by the contemporary savage had sometimes a destructive faith in his own impotence before the retributive powers of the gods he had invented. To break a strict Taboo was to incur penalties that he could not in some cases avert by any propitiation of the powers he had offended; and his beliefs were often deep enough to kill him by auto-suggestion,re-inforced by the warnings of witch-doctors and his own terrors.

The Greek Nemesis was no doubt partly a racial development of these early superstitions, but the conception was later rationalised and developed by the brilliant philosophical thought of the period. Originally allied to Artenus and a comparatively unimportant member of the Greek mythology, Nemesis came to be regarded as personifying the guardian of the law, and hence to be associated with the individual conscience. Later, however, we find her represented by Herodotus in the guise of an impersonal figure of destiny administering rewards and punishment to nations and individuals on principles that accord very nearly with those of the laws of Karma.

After the fall of Greece and Rome, however, darkness settled upon Europe and when we come to the revival of learning we find belief in destiny taking strange and perverted shapes. In the 16th Century for example, when the avenging "hate" of earlier beliefs had been crystallised into the conception of a single omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent god, the ideas of predestination or pre-ordination were hung as a perpetual threat over the human mind. The perversion in this creed of Calvin's is due to the oblivion of those aspects of the Greek Nemesis which gave it a true ethical value. The doctrine of Predestination assumes that every human being is born in sin and condemned, *ipso facto* to Eternal Punishment, unless he shall find "grace" by adopting certain sectarian beliefs, the essential attitudes required being those of repentance and submission, the latter to the tenets of the particular faith involved. In the development of Predestination, the precise nature of the submission and the manner of conversion presented various phases, some of which are still extant. But those who are interested will find the

typical absurdity admirably described in Principal L. P. Jacks's sketch "A Psychologist among the Saints".*

An aspect of this general fate-threat made by the tribal god still survives in all forms of the Christian religion. The great Taboo remains, but altered in form so that the eating of the forbidden fruit appears now as the falling away from the "true faith" in whatever particular version it may be presented by the sect in question, with the emphasis laid on the positive act of submission as the "sole means of grace". The threat, however, remains the same, eternal damnation no matter what may have been the individual's moral and spiritual life. "Unless ye thus believe in the Trinity, ye cannot be saved," says the Athanasian creed of the English Church; and the Roman Church, though it may offer Purgatory for the alleviation of its own sinners, holds out no hope to those who die in another faith.

We come to a more intelligent and intelligible version of the belief in Fate, in the old philosophical dispute between Determinism and Free-will; and we may quote our definition of the former as being :—"that every action is causally connected not only externally with the agent's environment, but also internally with his motives and impulses. In other words, if we could know exactly all these conditions, we should be able to forecast with mathematical certainty the course which the agent would pursue. On this theory the agent cannot be held responsible in any sense".

The form taken by this contention displays the influence of science. We have substituted for the tribal god, an inexorable process. All question of rewards and punishment has disappeared, and man is presented as no more than a by-product of evolution,—an interesting phenomenon but probably ephemeral. This, perhaps, the most pessimistic and deadening of all beliefs, reached its maximum influence in the nineties of the last century, a time when materialism had its strongest hold on thinking minds in England. Since then its decline although slow has been sufficiently well-marked to indicate the general trend of opinion. And strangely enough, it has been the steady advance in the science of mathematical physics and the comparative stagnation of that of biology, which has been responsible for a sudden quickening in the process during the last ten years.

In fact these brief notes on the changing aspects of an over-ruling Fate, have their origin in Sir Arthur Eddington's presidential address to the Mathematical Association, reprinted as a Supplement to *Nature* in its issue of February 13th, 1932. The subject of the address was "The Decline of Determinism," and Sir Arthur having quoted definitions from Laplace and C. D. Broad, settled finally upon a third given by Fitzgerald in his translation of

* Included in *Among the Idolmakers* by L. P. Jacks. (Williams & Norgate, 1911)

Omar Khayyám !

With Earth's first Clay they did the last man knead,
And there of the Last Harvest sow'd the Seed:
And the first Morning of Creation wrote
What the Last Dawn of Reckoning shall read."*

Now the reason why this recent pronouncement of Science should have a peculiar significance for readers of THE ARYAN PATH, is that, as we shall presently see, Sir Arthur Eddington's exposition of the modern scientific attitude in this regard is one that will comfortably accommodate the doctrine of Karma, which for Theosophists takes the place of the Greek Nemesis,† and resolves the vexed problems of Fate and Retribution. For, as I have urged before in these pages, modern Science working along its own path is now continually stumbling upon the truths of the Inner Wisdom, throwing here and there little gleams of light into minds that cannot be reached by other means.

Sir Arthur's main argument opens with a division of physical phenomena into two classes, one that we regard as impossible, the other as highly improbable, and proceeds to show that we may safely prophesy that causes in the mass will produce certain results when "the predictions and regularities refer to average behaviour of the vast number of particles concerned in most of our observations"; but that when "we deal with fewer particles the indeterminacy begins to become appreciable . . . until finally the behaviour of a single atom or electron has a very large measure of indeterminacy".

Finally, to complete as nearly as may be the analogy we are seeking, Sir Arthur says, still speaking of the electron:—

> Actually we can have contemporaneous knowledge of the values of half the symbols, but never more than half . . . . . Instead of two paired symbols, one wholly known and the other wholly unknown, we can take two symbols each of which is known with some uncertainty; then the rule is that the product of the two uncertainties is fixed. Any interaction which reduces the uncertainty of determination of one increases the uncertainty of the other . . . We divide the uncertainty how we like but we cannot get rid of it.

The lecture closes with the words:—

> These revolutions of scientific thought are clearing up the deeper contradictions between life and theoretical knowledge, and the latest phase with its release from determinism marks a great step onwards. I will even venture to say that in the present theory of the physical universe we have at last reached something which a reasonable man might almost believe. (!)

We might go somewhat further than this in adding that scientific thought is slowly making its way towards a physical explanation of the universe which is implicit, however different the statement, in the ancient Wisdom-Religion; and that, whatever the method of enquiry, if the search is pressed

* It is an interesting commentary on the general subject to note that this, in effect a summary of Omar's philosophy, should have been written early in the 12th century. As an aspect of fatalism it may be put beside the Turkish proverb "What God has written upon your forehead, *that* will happen".

† Cp. *The Secret Doctrine* I, p. 642.

far enough, diligently and sincerely, all problems of life and matter will ultimately find a single solution. But for the moment our purpose is solely concerned with this question of free-will, and before going further it will be as well to make a brief summary of the three aspects in which it has been here presented.

The first is from the point of view of what may be described as "primitive religion" beginning with the earliest beliefs of the savage and reaching the stage at which Christianity, for example, has now arrived. In this development the dim realisation of determining law is always anthropomorphic and takes the figure of some superhuman being, earth-god, tribal god, world-god, each succeeding figure approaching more nearly to the ideal of omnipotence, and omniscience. But with these last ascriptions, the rationality of the figure begins to fail, since if God is all-powerful and all-knowing, his creation, man, becomes a mere puppet whose ultimate destiny must be foreseen by his creator and who is therefore bereft of all but the absurdest semblance of free-will. For there can be no logical escape from the deduction that if God knows the end, then that end is pre-determined.

The second point of view is that of philosophy of which all that need be said here is that after "great argument about it and about," we came out "by the same door" through which we entered, — inevitable consequence of the fact that the disputants to whom we listened were each and all arguing to prove a pre-determined assumption.

Finally we find this new-born science,—product of three centuries of applied learning and experiment, whose exponents have adopted the postulate that any result however unexpected and confounding must be accepted if it is sufficiently justified,—passing through a stage of strict determinism to emerge in the form indicated by the quotations given above.

Now what we find in common among these various aspects is a recognition of some over-ruling law, coupled with an inability to state it. The belief in Fate, of which even the most primitive man has an intuitive awareness, has led humanity to the wildest and most fantastic of deductions. The belief in the law of cause and effect influenced the scientists of yesterday to affirm that it was invariable and could not, in any circumstances, be affected by the human will. But in spite of superstition and science, an inner conviction not less than commonsense continues to fight a winning battle in defence of free-will.

And, as we so often find, the truth lies between the two extremes, Sir Arthur Eddington states the case for the physicist by saying that when we consider a collection of atoms the law of cause and effect holds, giving us the power of accurate prediction in the physical world; but that when we come to the contem-

plation of the ultimate unit, we are faced by the conclusion that it has a certain latitude within its own ambit. Let us compare that conclusion with what we know of the great law of Karma.

To begin with we may note that men and "angels" are "the slaves and creatures of immutable Karmic and Kosmic law,"* and that "those who believe in Karma have to believe in *destiny*".† But this law, on the scientific analogy is that which prevails when we regard matter or humanity in the mass. Let us now consider that individual who corresponds to the electron. "Man," writes Madame Blavatsky "is a free agent during his stay on earth. He cannot escape his *ruling* Destiny, but he has the choice of two paths that lead him in that direction."‡ Thus we see that Sir Arthur Eddington's analogy draws a little closer. Our electron about which he can posit one certainty only at the expense of increasing our uncertainty regarding it in another direction, appears within the limits imposed to have a choice of alternatives, but no escape from the "*ruling* Destiny".

Nevertheless if we carry the matter one step further we see that the law is ultimately one of our own making. Karma, in effect, is self-induced, an inevitable result of certain first causes, and one that must obtain until its purpose is satisfied. But "were no man to hurt his brother, Karma-Nemesis would have neither cause to work for, nor weapons to act through. It is the constant presence in our midst of every element of strife and opposition . . . that is the chief cause of the 'ways of Providence' . . . Karma-Nemesis is no more than the (spiritual) dynamical effect of causes produced and forces awakened into activity by our own actions."§

Here, then, we have the heart of the whole matter. We see free-will determined by its own exercise and invalidating itself by wrong use. We have the power of choice but it will be progressively delimited if we choose wrongly. Thus Free-will and Determinism co-exist and re-act one upon the other,—even as in the happy analogy Sir Arthur Eddington has provided by his instance of the electron in which "any interaction which reduces the uncertainty of determination of one increases the uncertainty of the other". For our wrong choice in previous incarnations tends always to circumscribe the exercise of free-will in the incarnation that follows.¶

Yet at the end we may believe that "good will be the final goal of ill," and the law of Karma-Nemesis be resolved.

J. D. BERESFORD

* The *Secret Doctrine*, I. 276. † Loc. cit. I. 639. ‡ Loc. cit. I. 639. § Loc. cit. I. 643,4.
¶ An interesting example may be found in "Karmic Visions" by "Saujna" (H. P. Blavatsky) originally printed in *Lucifer* in June 1888.

MY DUTY

[**Dr. Paul E. Johnson** is Professor of Philosophy at Hamline University (St. Paul, Minnesota, U. S. A.); he has lived in China and is able to appreciate oriental points of view. He has written two articles—"My Duty" and "Your Law". The conflict of duties is talked about by every man and every woman and is continuously discussed from a thousand platforms. The problem nears solution only when discussions on theories give way and actual action is being devised. Carlyle was right when he said that "the end of man is an *action* and not a *thought*, though it were the noblest". The Theosophical teaching on charity, sacrifice, etc., in relation to duty as action is described by H. P. Blavatsky in her *Key to Theosophy* (p. 191 *et seq*) in a very practical way.—EDS.]

My duty is under suspicion. It has enjoyed an honourable past. Even when unwelcome, it has been respected. Though endured as necessary evil, it has yet been well spoken of. It has associated with the best company and played with the noblest sentiments. But now its place in modern society is less secure. It is secretly resented and openly abused as enemy to freedom, remnant of slave-morality, symptom of morbid repression. What shall we do with our duty? It may not be comfortable to have around, but on the other hand it is hardly just to condemn it without a hearing. In the face of these conditions, it would seem to be our duty to examine our duty. Let us ask of duty three leading questions: What? Where? Why?

First of all it is essential to know *what* is my duty. A duty is a recognized obligation. It is something due or required that one has no right to overlook. It is an ought that demands obedience, a stern challenge that cannot honorably be denied. A duty frequently involves difficulty, invokes effort, often sacrifice and deprivation. This has given rise to the impression that duty is opposed to desire. So the ethics of "rigor and vigor" has called men to conquer their desires and renounce natural inclinations. Conduct is moral, says Kant, only when consciously performed from duty.

The artificial rigour of such teaching is evident. Shall we not desire the good life, and did not Kant himself most earnestly desire his duty? No little disfavour has fallen upon duty by such false contrasts. Finding effective goodness in much human desire, it is not surprising that many have chosen it instead of formal duty. But there is a valid contrast between the conduct of purpose and impulse. There are two tendencies in human conduct; one is impulsive response to every stimuli, instinct, or desire without regard to plan or outcome, without effort to direction or control; the other is reflective behaviour which seeks definite goals and brings inclination under the discipline of will.

Duty is not the enemy of natural impulse. Its task is certainly not to crush desire or deny inclination. *But to act from duty is*

always something more than to act on impulse. It is characterized at all times by a sense of direction, a consciousness of going somewhere for some cause. The duty motive is opposed to aimless activity. It objects to following the line of least resistance, whether it be the inertia of habit or the carelessness of mere impulse. It is control of conduct by clear principle and steady purpose. A duty need not be disagreeable, nor should its worth be measured by its difficulty. But it must be approved by the whole self, and pursued with conscious resolution. To accept a duty is to have a purpose for living.

In the second place, *where* is my duty? It may be interesting to contemplate duty in general, but for practical purposes it is more urgent to know where our duty lies. For no sooner do we begin to assume duties than we run into difficulties. Duties conflict and obstruct each other. There are many claims to duty. Who can follow them all? There are many voices calling in contradictory tones, yet all in the name of duty. The Kentucky mountaineer *ought* to ambush his neighbour and defend his family. The American patriot *ought* to murder, steal, lie and hate in 1917, and love, speak truth, be honest and mild in 1927. The business man *ought* to serve his customer and drive his competitor out of business. The advertiser *ought* to tell the truth and sell his goods by skilful falsehood. The politician *ought* to save his country and destroy the other party at any cost.

Where in all this maze of conflicting codes and loyalties shall the honest seeker know his duty? There are many to suggest and even command. But by its very nature, a duty cannot come in this way. *My duty cannot be imposed upon me from without, or required by external enforcement. No other can give or assign me my duty. A friend can advise; a government can compel legal obedience; a community can exercise the authority of social approval or disapproval. But a duty is by nature of its moral character self-imposed. I must accept it for myself in order that it be mine.* For duty is voluntary obligation.

This may appear to increase our difficulty. To make every man a law unto himself only promises to add to the conflict already so disconcerting. It has exactly the danger of democracy, that authority rests with the people instead of descending upon them from above. And freedom of conscience goes farther in this direction than legal privilege or political franchise. For whereas legal, political, or social authority operates from without, the moral authority of conscience acts from within. While a democratic Government places legal restraints upon me, the claim of a duty resides only in the free decision of my conscience to accept it. And by conscience we mean no strange voices from distant heaven or muttering earthly crowds, but the whole mind of the individual engaged to the best of his ability in

moral judgment.

The dangers of individual judgment are chiefly ignorance and selfishness. As Jefferson saw that education is the safeguard of democracy, so we may recognize that intelligence is the safeguard of conscience. My conscience is just as good and no better than my individual judgment; and my first duty is to educate that judgment to know what this duty ought to be. The danger of selfishness is more serious, but it will likewise yield to wise treatment. The remedy lies in seeing that my duty is wherever good may be found. As Walter G. Everett† suggests, duty is co-extensive with human values. That is to say wherever a good or human value is at stake, there is a duty. Wherever it is possible to conserve or increase the sum total of human values, the good man has cause to act.

We often have an impulse to act where our own good is at stake. There appears to be a more elemental urge to save my good than to undergo risks for the welfare of others. The so-called instinct of self-preservation has been loaded with our manifold sins of selfishness and driven back to the wilderness. We are in the habit of pronouncing human nature selfish, and easily assume that every man will naturally look out for himself. But it is not true that every man naturally looks after his own interests. Persistently we deny our good of the future for the good of the present. Continually we take the part for the whole, surrender the larger part for the fragment.

If we can extend our view of the good to larger perspectives, the failures of fragmentary living will be corrected. The man who can bring himself to consider his own future good, will then by the same process lift his eyes more readily to the good of others. The expansion of attention to more remote goods thus means extension of appreciation in every direction until we find our duty concerns the distant values of other persons as well as our own future. In fact, so inclusive is the network of human relations that to be a member of the human race at all is to find my good bound up with the good of others. My very status as a human being concerned in the fate of human values, endows me with a duty toward all fellow-creatures. It is myopic to suppose my duty could end with myself, my family, or my nation. For values are everywhere related, and the good we seek is common weal attainable in the largest sense only by common consent. *The good of all, when rightly viewed is the duty of each.*

Yes, perhaps, if every one accepts his duty. But it is all too evident that everyone does not do his duty. The most urgent question after all is not what or where but why. *Why* should I do my duty? Because it is reasonable. No one can deny it is unreasonable to live by mere habit or impulse. For habits and

† *Moral Values*, p. 252.

impulses are naturally unreasoned; they act often unconsciously, usually without careful scrutiny or attention. They are what they are by virtue of their freedom from reflective control. But it may also be insisted that duty too is unreasonable, with exhibits of fanatical cases in which blind obedience to duty thwarted reason. To this we simply reply: that is not what we mean by duty. *Blind duty is either habit or impulse and thus contradicts the duty of intelligent purpose.* My duty must be reasoned. Inherited duty is not mine, but another's; habitual duty is not my present duty; impulsive duty is not my consistent, persistent duty. Only after reasoning upon our motives do they become clear purpose. And only then have we any right to act from duty, because it is reasonable to defend the good.

Again, why my duty? Because it is independent. Every duty is a declaration of independence, a revolt against bondage to custom or external coercion. My duty may coincide at most points, (in truth it should at many points) with the legal and moral standards of the group. For man is a social animal and his good as we have noted is largely consonant with the social good. But the mark of a duty is that it is not altogether another's choice but my own. I freely choose to obey this law or coincide with that custom, and the acts springing from this motive have quite a different flavour from those of a slave beaten into submission. They are voluntary obligations and carry the joyous eagerness of a race in which a man desires the goal he strives after. The advantage of duty over legal restraint is just this unification of all desires and driving forces in human nature, just this release of all one's powers into the direct channel of a chosen aim. It is the advantage of independent motive power, of self-control over remote control.

Finally, why my duty? Because it is responsible. Impulsive motives are like sails waiting for a breeze, or moods dallying with the chance temper of the moment. Duty-motives are steady, for they are geared into regular purposes which hold true above variations of wind and weather or mood and temperament. The man who is good or honest, kind or just only when he feels like it is not the easiest one to live with. The public servant who is faithful to his task only when the mood is upon him is hardly to be trusted. Duty is the one dependable motive for conduct. The destiny of human values is too dear to leave to chance, to impulse or passing mood. It is my duty to live by duty.

Next—"Your Law".

PAUL E. JOHNSON

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

"NATURAL" AND "SPIRITUAL" MYSTICISM*
SHANKARA AND ECKHART

[**D. L. Murray** wields a silent but powerful influence by casting the thought of the British public into an idealistic mould. In this able review of a remarkable volume he provokes thought on several occasions: students of Theosophy should examine it in the light of their philosophy, while those not familiar with H. P. Blavatsky's instructions will find it a useful and elevating experience to define and reconcile the distinction between "natural" and "spiritual" mysticisms.—EDS.]

Theosophy, H. P. Blavatsky tells us in her *Theosophical Glossary* is "Wisdom Religion, the one religion which underlies all the now existing creeds—the substratum and basis of all the world-religions and philosophies". The ideal of a universal human religion is one to which many will subscribe who are not able to accept all the detailed revelations to be found in the literature of modern Theosophy; and that the religious experience of humanity under different forms and in different ages and climes presents these universal features, to which Theosophy appeals, is a point to which Dr. Rudolf Otto's latest book contributes a weighty proof.

> East is East and West is West,
> And never the twain shall meet.

If there is any sphere in which that is true, it is *not*, declares the distinguished auther of *The Idea of the Holy*, the sphere of religion, the sphere of mysticism. To prove this assertion, he has made a systematic study, as thorough and laborious as only a German scholar knows how to make, of two classic masters of mysticism, one from the East and one from the West. The Eastern teacher is the Indian Acharya Sankara, who flourished about 800 A.D.; the Western is the medieval German Meister Eckhart who lived between 1250 and 1327 A.D. The creeds of these two teachers were different; their philosophic cultures were different. By no possibility can Eckhart have known and been influenced by his great Asiatic forerunner. In these circumstances it might seem strange if the Brahman and the Catholic Christian agreed in a general sense upon the main principles of their faith. What Prof. Otto demonstrates with an abundance of detailed quotation is something much stranger. It is that there is an almost word-for-word correspondence between these two mystical writers all along the line of their metaphysical

* *Mysticism, East and West.* A Comparative Analysis of the nature of Mysticism. By RUDOLF OTTO (Macmillan, London. 16*s.* net)

affirmations and their devotional precepts. It might seem at times almost as if one Spirit were dictating to them the very phrases in which they were to record an identical message.

Nor does the wonder end here. For in an Appendix (important enough really to have been incorporated in the text) Prof. Otto examines the religious thought of Johan Gottlieb Fichte, the celebrated Idealistic philosopher and disciple of Kant, who wrote in the first years of the nineteenth century and behold! we are able to trace the same line of thought once again, and with the same close resemblances of phraseology, so that Dr. Otto in making extracts from Fichte is able repeatedly to set in brackets the Indian equivalents for the ideas that the German philosopher is expressing, though, as he says, "in Fichte there is not the slightest trace of direct relation which the East (just as he had no intimate knowledge of Eckhart)".

Only a close study of Dr. Otto's book itself can adequately supply a knowledge of the doctrines upon which there exists this remarkable consensus of East and West. But we may quote his own summary of the points upon which the two teachers he has principally studied coincide.

> Brahman, high above the personal God; the personal God submerged and disappearing in the suprapersonal Brahman; the indentity of the soul and Brahman; salvation as identity with Brahman; Brahman determined as the unqualified, pure Being and Spirit, without attributes, without distinctions within itself; the world lacking real being, floating in the indefiniteness of Māyā and Avidyā—all these have, point for point, their parallels in Eckhart, extending even to a surprising identity of phrase.

And in addition to these great ideas which the Indian and the Teuton both accept, there are also, in Dr. Otto's opinion, certain large principles which they are agreed in rejecting. (1) Both are opposed to "illuminism," which Dr. Otto does not define very closely, though he includes in it "fantastic visions, occultism, or miracle-hunting"; the illuminist "experiences objects of a supersensual but still empirical sphere by means of a sixth sense". The knowledge that Sankara and Eckhart pursue is "utterly different from all knowledge of the senses or of reflection, or anything we can achieve by logical mental processes." It follows that, (2) according to them, the true mystical apprehension does not come through emotion, from excited states of feeling. It is "knowledge based upon real being," though not gained by ordinary process of argument. And lastly (3) they are both, Dr. Otto insists with especial vigour, opposed to "nature-mysticism," as expressed in such verses as

> I am the mist of the morning. I am the breath of even.
> I am the rustling of the grove, the surging wave of the sea.

Theirs, we are told, is "a spiritual, not a nature mysticism . . . . a spiritual, not a natural nor an aesthetic valuation". Nature mysticism, in Dr. Otto's view, is "a sublimated naturalism even in its highest and most abstract forms, and therefore easily passes into the fervour of erotic mysticism"—a snare to be avoided.

It is upon this last point that the present reviewer would wish to offer some diffident remarks from a standpoint that may be described as (in a very loose sense) Platonist. Dr. Otto, it now becomes important to inform the reader, is not concerned simply with the points of agreement between his two mystics: he is conscious,and wishes to make us equally conscious, of points of divergence. On the basis of a wide common conviction he finds that the "Gothic" Eckhart and the Oriental Sankara build certain deeply differing doctrines. The chief of these antitheses and the one upon which I wish to dwell, concerns the true significance of that world of multiplicity, of Becoming, the Kantian realm of phenomena, the Indian veil of Maya, behind which must be sought the indivisible Unity of the Godhead, pure Being, the *noumenon*. What is the relation of the One to the Many? Let us hear Dr. Otto :—

> When Eckhart insists that we must also leave God [*i. e.* the personal God of popular and dogmatic religion] and climb beyond God, that God disappears and enters into the mode-less Godhead, it might seem as if this going forth of God and of the world with God out of the depth of the Godhead, were only an unhappy anomaly, a fate to be redeemed or a great cosmic mistake to be corrected. This is indeed the case with Śankara, for whom the coming forth of God and the world from the primeval oneness of Brahman is the great "mistake" of Avidyā. But it is not so with Eckhart. God is the wheel rolling out of itself, which, rolling on, not rolling back, reaches its first position again. . . . . But it is not an error to be corrected in Him, that He is eternally going out from and entering "into" Himself; it is a fact that has meaning and value—as the expression of life manifesting its potentiality and fullness.

Now what is here presented (we may note) is a divergence between Eckhart and Sankara, rather than between "Gothic" (*i.e.*, Northern European) thought and Oriental thought as such. For Dr. Otto informs us with the full authority of his immense studies in Indian mysticism that there are other types of Indian religious thought which avoid this absolute negation of the value of activity within the phenomenal realm, renouncing "Nirvana in order to remain in the unending activity of Samsāra" (page 231). But is this preference for the "dynamic" over the "static" type of mysticism, this faith in Eckhart's God who "glows and burns without ceasing with all His riches, all His sweetness, all His joy" *within* the world of ordinary experience, which "becomes, when it is found again in God, a place of joy and of joyous spontaneous action in all good works," is this preference really consistent with the uncompromising rejection of nature-mysticism which we have already quoted? If Eckhart made such a cleavage is Eckhart on this point a good teacher for today? Dr. Otto here seems to us to be misled by his own well-known doctrine of the *numinous*, of the Divine as revealed in the

character of the "Wholly Other". For if we take this idea of the "Wholly Other" literally we must be shut up in that mysticism which negates activity, we must acquiesce in an Ultimate Reality that utterly transcends the world of ordinary living and excludes it. But if the Godhead is "the wheel rolling out of itself" and informing life in its "potentiality and fullness," then it is surely impossible to limit this immanence to the sphere of ethical endeavour and to the quest for salvation in the narrowest religious sense. We shall not oppose the "spiritual" to the "natural" and "aesthetic" valuations," but seek to trace the Spirit in nature and beauty as in all the manifestations of the hidden Source of Life. There is no true opposition between a natural and a spiritual mysticism, only between a vital and a devitalizing religion.

D. L. MURRAY

THE PUZZLE OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY*

[**C. E. M. Joad** has been praised and criticized in the press for the last several weeks because of his two new books. We have the co-operation of his keen western brain which analyses and examines the product of the painstaking eastern brains of Professor Dasgupta.

In his review Mr. Joad raises the interesting question of the Indian theory of the evolution of philosophy in particular and, by implication of knowledge in general. *Shruti* (Revelation), *Smriti* (Tradition), *Itihasa-Purana* (History-Mythology) mean something quite different from what these terms imply in western theology, Christian mysticism and modern science. On this subject THE ARYAN PATH hopes to publish some useful articles.—EDS.]

Ten years ago Professor Dasgupta brought out the first volume of his history of Indian philosophy. The work achieved immediate recognition. It was destined, it was obvious from the first, to become the standard work on the subject. It was clear, it was scholarly, it was authoritative, and it was enormously comprehensive. In an Introductory chapter Professor Dasgupta surveyed the ground which he then proposed to cover. The first volume was to contain an account of the Vedas, the Brahmanas and the earlier Upanishads, the Buddhist philosophy, the Jaina philosophy, the Samkhya-Yoga, the Nyaya-Vaisesika and the Mimamsa systems; the Sankara School of the Vedanta the treatment of which was begun in the first, the philosophies of the Yoga-Vasistha and of the Bhagavad-Gita together with an account of the speculations of the Indian medieval schools were reserved for a second. At the end of the second volume there was also promised a chapter containing Professor Dasgupta's estimate of the value of the philosophical development

* *A History of Indian Philosophy*. By SURENDRANATH DASGUPTA. Two Vols. (Cambridge University Press. 30*s*. and 35*s*.)

he had described. After a ten years' interval the second volume, delayed by the ill-health of the author, has at last appeared. It has all the virtues of the first, and it faithfully fulfils its promise in regard to the ground covered; but the concluding chapter of critical estimate of Indian philosophy as a whole is missing. Instead, the author speaks in his new Preface of a third volume dealing with pluralistic and dualistic systems of Indian philosophy, and even of a fourth and a fifth which will describe the lesser known schools of Vaisnavism, and give some account of Indian aesthetics and political philosophies of law and right. The third volume, we are told, is nearly ready, but we shall, I am afraid, have to wait a considerable time for Professor Dasgupta's own comments upon his long journey through the wilds of Indian thought, if, as he originally intended, he reserves his chapter of estimate and valuation to the end of his survey.

In the absence of this last chapter Professor Dasgupta's method may be described as that of pure exposition. His object is to tell us exactly what the doctrines are which different Indian philosophers have held, how they have developed and how they are related to each other, with no more of comment and interpretation than will serve the purpose of exposition. In order to make sure of rendering his account and interpretation of the various systems as accurate as possible, Professor Dasgupta has gone wherever possible to the original sources. More particularly in the recently published second volume he has had recourse to manuscripts unpublished, and, in some cases, previously unknown. Not only were they moth-eaten and difficult to read, but as he tells us with justifiable pathos, it was only after he had read them all through that he could assure himself that most of them contained no new matter worth recording, and that beyond the satisfaction which this assurance gave him, his time and trouble had been wasted.

Absorbed in his task of exposition, Professor Dasgupta has studiously refrained from comparing Indian with European philosophical ideas. In many cases the parallels are close enough—*practically all the theories which the West fondly regards as its own are to be found somewhere or other in this immense speculative mass*,—the main difference being, in his own words, "the difference of the point of view from which the same problems appeared in such a variety of forms in the two countries,"—but he has left it to others to point them out. He has also refrained from criticism of the views of other critics whose interpretations differ from his own, a duty which, he says, many friends have enjoined upon him; but, as he drily remarks, "criticism has been considered beyond the scope of this work

which, as at present planned, will cover some 3,000 pages when completed".

Raised by Professor Dasgupta's exertions to an eminence from which it is possible to take a bird's eye view of the whole field, one is able to appreciate for the first time the distinguishing characteristics of Hindu thought, and to understand the wideness of the gulf that separates it from European philosophy. It may not be out of place to consider for a moment the reasons for this separation, and for the consequent ignorance of and comparative indifference to Indian philosophy in the West. For this lack of understanding there are, I think, two main reasons: the form of Indian philosophy is unfamiliar, the content unsympathetic. The form of most of the Indian systems is broadly the same. There is a set of poems or prose aphorisms, the Vedas or the Upanishads, from which the system derives and upon which it is based. There are treatises written in short pregnant sentences, the *sutras*, usually in commentary or exposition of the original poems or of the ideas contained in them. The *sutras* being held in the greatest respect, any new thought or speculation which occurs to subsequent thinkers is announced in the form of a commentary upon or development of the thought of the *sutras*. It has, therefore, first to be reconciled with them, in the sense of being shown to be merely a development of ideas already latent in them, and secondly, to defend itself against the criticism of rival systems. In this way, the original poems, the *sutras*, and the commentaries upon and developments of the *sutras* come to form an elaborate system. As the system grows, it has to meet unexpected criticisms, and to withstand the impact of new ideas for which it is not in the least prepared. Thus each system "grew and developed by the untiring energy of its adherents through all the successive ages of history; and a history of this growth is a history of its conflicts".

The process I have recorded is quite unlike anything in Western thought, and gives to Indian philosophy an air of unfamiliarity. The original poems and prose aphorisms consist of philosophical truths intuitively perceived, revelations of reality, which are considered to need neither argument nor defence. The *sutras* are more like lecture notes than books; short and pithy, they bristle with technical terms and are full of allusions to the objections brought by rival systems which they are seeking to refute. Not only are the technical terms not explained, but they are used in different senses in different places, while the allusions, intelligible enough to those who no doubt had direct oral instructions on the subject, are lost upon Western readers.

Puzzled by the form of Indian philosophy, the Westerner is unable to see why it should have been adopted. Is it not, he cannot help wondering, prejudicial to new thought to compel it to accommodate itself within the bounds of a traditional system? Does not the religious veneration with which the systems are regarded as complete compendia of truth tend to stifle free enquiry, and to substitute scholarship and textual criticism, dialectical skill and the ingenuity which is required of those who must fit new pieces into old frameworks, for the free play of the unfettered mind? The Westerner finds the implied criticism of these reflections confirmed by Professor Dasgupta.

> All the independence of their thinking was limited and enchained by the faith of the school to which they were attached. Instead of producing a succession of free-lance thinkers having their own systems to propound and establish, India had brought forth schools of pupils who carried the traditionary views of particular systems from generation to generation, who explained and expounded them, and defended them against the attacks of other rival schools which they constantly attacked in order to establish the superiority of the system to which they adhered.

The history of the systems extends for about two thousand years. Their development seems to have stopped about the beginning of the seventeenth century, and with the development of the systems Indian philosophy itself seems to have come to a standstill.

In the second place the doctrines themselves, although of profound metaphysical importance, are uncongenial to the Western temperament. In a valuable chapter on the unity of Hindu thought, Professor Dasgupta singles out the doctrine of Karma, the doctrine of Mukti and the doctrine of the Soul (this last, of course, is not to be found in Buddhist philosophy) as common to most of the Indian systems, and specifies a pessimistic attitude to this world as a pervasive feature of all of them. That these doctrines do in fact encourage the attitude of fatalistic resignation which seems to the Westerner to characterise the East, is, I think, undeniable, and his temperamental incapacity for renunciation in life is at once the source and the measure of his instinctive antipathy to the doctrines which seem to him to require it. He can, for example, never rid himself of the suspicion that the doctrine of Karma is perilously akin to a purely passive Fatalism. I do not myself think that this suspicion is just; for by knowledge, contemplation and strict adherence to the five great vows a man may liquidate his past karma, and, no more karma being generated, break the chain of birth and rebirth which the potency of past karma entails. But whence are to be derived the determination and the will necessary to acquire the knowledge and to keep the vows? If a man is free, free *before* he has liquidated his karma, well and good; there is no difficulty and he can at any moment begin the new life which the Indian sage enjoins. But how, then, represent him as at the same time determined by the

fruits of past karma which he is reaping?

Again, Indian philosophy teaches that pleasure is an appearance only, and that indulgence in it only perpetuates a long train of causes and effects in which pain is bound to preponderate over pleasure. The Western's reasons may be convinced but his heart is untouched. Not only does he on the whole enjoy this world, but he believes that a certain amount of pleasure in it is good for him, and instinctively feels that those who belittle this world and its enjoyments are really crying sour grapes. These are temperamental and not intellectual differences. The European middle-classes, and it is the middle classes who have written the books and formed the ideas of the West, probably have as pleasant lives as any race of human beings that have yet existed, and they are not going to be easily convinced that they are miserable because the assumption of their misery is required to prove the truth of a particular philosophy. They are much more inclined to think that there must be something wrong with a philosophy which can be true, only if they are unhappy.

C. E. M. JOAD

The Ethical Religion of Zoroaster. By M. M. DAWSON, LL. D. (Macmillan & Co., New York).

"The preparation of this book has taken nearly fifteen years"; its writing was undertaken at the suggestion of Rev. Andrew Jackson Jutkins D. D. of the Methodist Episcopal Church to whom it is dedicated. It is a companion Volume to the author's *Ethics of Confucius*, and *Ethics of Socrates.*

With patience Dr. Dawson has selected and classified quotations; he has linked them with his own remarks; thus each of the 33 chapters is devoted to a particular topic. The book gives a very good idea of the Zoroastrian creed as it is viewed by minds not influenced by mysticism. However, the author has shown discrimination in not rejecting Pehlevi books; nor has he confined himself to the *Gathas*, but has made use of Yasts and Nyasis also. Pehlevi, Pazand and Persian texts are a part of the Zoroastrian tradition and affect the daily life of modern Zoroastrians even more than do the Gathas.

It is one of those volumes which informs the Christian world about the teaching of an oriental religion. As such, we must regard it as belonging to this second period during which the labours of the orientalists who translated sacred texts are being utilized for the benefit of the general public. The first period closed with the completion of the task of translation of all important oriental texts. The second is devoted to understanding and appreciating the old-world faiths. Those who would never go to a series like the *Sacred Books of the East* will read one like *The Wisdom of the East.* The volume before us is of the latter type. Such volumes prepare the work of the third period yet to commence, when the mystic and not only the metaphysical, the esoteric and not only the ethical aspects of ancient eastern religions will be studied. Then will the world perceive the Theosophical teaching that there is a common source from which all philosophies and religions have sprung; and all of them for a common purpose—to help man to understand his own nature which is identical with the Great Nature; to aid him in realizing that God is within him, nay is himself, master of all processes in manifested universe.

S. B.

The Religion of Tibet. By SIR CHARLES BELL. (The Clarendon Press, Oxford. 18*s.*)

Tibet has attracted the attention of different peoples for diverse reasons throughout the millennium and a half of its recorded history. The un-recorded pre-historic past of the country remains largely down to this day the *Terra incognita* even to anthropologists. This character of *unknownness* clings to very many institutions of Tibet which, has succeeded in sustaining its world-championship as the "forbidden" country, defying the most subtle tactics of modern publicity. The lure of occultism deepens round such an unknown entity in the human family and generations of intrepid researchers, of secular as well as of spiritual leanings, have attempted to penetrate the veil of mysteries across the Himalayas. Sir Charles Bell is a renowned authority on Tibetology and his *Tibet: Past and Present*, (1924) and the *People of Tibet*, (1928) is now followed up by the *Religion of Tibet*, completing a cycle of fascinating survey richly illustrated and documented. Living amidst the Tibetans for 18 years with one year in the forbidden city of Lhasa, and speaking their language as he did, the author could pronounce his opinions on some of the most intricate problems of the inner life of the Tibetan people. Moreover, this extensive knowledge of things Tibetan deepened his sympathies for the people and gave him a rare intuition as the supreme price for years of painstaking research. He preserved a thorough objectivity of judgment and enriched his narrative with shrewd observations of men and things; and hence his pictorial documents are no less interesting than the literary ones which he has handled with rare mastery and discrimination. For years his book will remain the best descriptive survey of the Tibetan sects, organizations, and their workings. Two valuable pictures, one representing the Indian Buddhist Pandits, *Arya Asanga* and *Vasubandhu* painted by Tibetan artist, and another, a photo of the tomb of the renowned Bengali Buddhist reformer of the Tibetan religion, *Atisha.* (1000 A. D.) bring back to our mind the fact that India and Tibet stand mysteriously linked up spiritually through Buddhism in spite of almost desperate barriers physical, ethnical and linguistic. Allowance being made naturally for the inevitable falling off from the pristine purity of early Indian Buddhism, we must still consider it to be very remarkable that a people whom their next door neighbour, China (a cousin, moreover, of the Sino-Tibetan family) always despises as "troublesome savages," were embraced into the spiritual fold of Buddhism and reclaimed from savagery to civilization.

The secret of success of Buddhist India in this act of cultural reclamation has been found hy the author to lie in the deep humanitarian impulse of the religion of the Buddha. "All good works whatever are not worth one-sixteenth part of the love, which sets free the heart. Love which sets free the heart comprises them". (*Itivuttaka*, iii. 7) It is this hidden current of disinterested love which fertilised for centuries the awful deserts of Central Asia and which influenced the mind and soul of the nomadic hordes of the Turanians, the Turko-Mongolians and the Sino-Tibetans who vyed with one another for over one thousand years in building centres of cultural and spiritual activities in the monasteries of Khotan, Turfan, Kucha, Tuen Huang and other zones of Ser-Indian archæology, and Tibet is one of the biggest and most remarkable laboratories of this cultural fusion. Its pre-historic chapter of Shamanism, magic, human sacrifices etc. attached to the old *Pon* religion were slowly but surely transformed by Indian Buddhism which had to make a series of compromises with the preceding cults. The history of the introduction of Buddhism, its expulsion and return, till it became the national religion of Tibet has been narrated through the first hundred strirring pages of the book; while the second half is devoted to a most valuable and

painstaking description of the later Tibetan sects and their priesthood, slowly extending its sway for the whole of Tibet and even beyond to Mongolia, the bone of contention between China and Tibet for centuries. The tolerance, of the Buddhist Mongal Khans of Central Asia was proverbial, for they invited the first miniature Parliament of Religions, with Christians, Zoroastrians and Confucians working peacefully before the Assembly of the Buddhist Khans. Tibetans were the great intermediaries in this transmission of India's culture to the Far East and the history of Tibet, therefore, should gain increased importance in the mind of the students of Asiatic history. We missed very much the section on the Art of Tibet; (Tibetan painting, bronze, etc.) which is the twin sister of Tibetan religion. The valuable researches of MM. Paul Pelliot, Hacking, Bacot, G. Roerich and others also might have been utilized, to demonstrate that some of the finest specimens of Asiatic *arts* and *handicrafts* have come from our friends of Tibet.

KALIDAS NAG

Indian Dust, being Letters from the Punjab. By PHILIP ERNEST RICHARDS. (George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 6s.)

The end of the reading brings a sense of disappointment. Not that these letters written to kith and kin are not colourful; not that they are devoid of sincere thinking and earnest aspiring; but that such a man as Richards having laboured in this country for nearly a decade should have got so little out of the real India!

He had a vision of the Great Mother ere he left his native land; he wrote:

> The Himalayas are the loftiest mountains in the world. Indian sages are the sagest in the world. India is the oldest, the most mysterious, the wisest land in the world—and we are going to India!
>
> Envy us, congratulate us. (p. 16)

His intuition led him to the feet of that devoted servant of Sarasvati, Brijendra Nath Seal, who was a fellow passenger on that voyage to India the only one which Richards took. That voyage "made a new man of him". He came to teach English literature at the Dyal Singh College, Lahore; after four years he went to the Islamia College of the same city. He died and his body went to the dust of India, he loved.

During the first month of his arrival he said:

> Only a god could give India all the love a man would give India; and only a god could say of India how beautiful she is, and what greatness lies ahead of her (p. 28).
>
> I do not feel in the least superior to the world here, nor yet inferior. . . . . It will be seen that India is immortal. When she has learned a few lessons from the West, she may lead the world. If India *were* India, Great Britain would not be so on top of the world as she is now—even in practical matters. (p. 31).

Richards had no use for the missionary "who keeps a carriage, has electric light and electric fans in his house and suffers other hardships for the gospel" (p. 97) but he confesses that "I would have a carriage and electric fans if I saw the way to them" (p. 98) in spite of the fact that he told Ramsay MacDonald that he was a Socialist (p. 98). In justice to him however it must be pointed out that he believed that "a people devoid of the means of action with effect, in the daily concerns of life, cannot possess the things of the spirit. Trade is a moralizing and a spiritual force—trade and manufacture are essential to manhood. That is the rather surprising conclusion I have come to out of the ripe experience of five months" (p. 48). He was a free-thinker (p.47) and was "at a loss to understand why different religions should despise each other when they are so much alike" (p. 91). And he was not a rank materialist: "I am unconvinced by Sir Oliver Lodge and other psychic writers. I incline to believe in ghosts, but even ghosts do not persuade me in immortality. I neither believe nor disbelieve" (p. 197). Yet—

> In every one of us there is something divine that puts on flesh and endures a thousand ills, and deserves its reward for its heroic deed in becoming human (p. 129).
>
> "I hold by faith, not by memory, the belief in previous incarnations" (p. 17).

The Volume is divided into three parts; it should have been into two. The first half contains a record of his intuitive perceptions, a clear insight, untainted by the corroding influence of the society of Britons in India. Richards started out well—"God, Sir, if you come out here I wonder what you would think of Anglo-Indians. I have met but occasional samples of them, for neither Norah nor I seek society, except Indian Society" (p. 55). But he did not succeed in resisting that soul-killing influence, as the second half of the book shows. Why was this?

With idealism and with vision he started; feeling that here was ancient grandeur and ageless wisdom he wanted to touch the border of the Sari of the Real India; and yet, he seems to have made no attempt to seek out the reason of India's immortality, mystery, sagacity. For example he did not prepare himself by study and contemplation ere he set out for Amarnath—it was a journey, not a pilgrimage. He could not fathom the meaning of the cry of the devotee—"Amarnath, I come, I come!"; he ends his descriptive letter—"Religion! a gruesome subject my masters". He did not succeed in piercing the maya of psychic and creedal India, behind which lies hidden her real soul.

This type of Britisher is not uncommon in India. He sees that—

> Kindness is the rule in India. If a civilization is to be judged by its manners before all other tests, then India possesses a more advanced civilization than the West . . . . Almost everyone here gives you love, and looks for it. Christian resignation seems to be practised here every day, by Mohamedans, Hindus, and Sikhs; who, in worldly respects, are so poor and defenceless; whose living is a few rupees, and whose death is perhaps a puff of fever. (p. 26).

And yet he does not ask what force moulded such tolerance and such disregard for earthly existence.

He finds that—

> Almost every student in the college wins love at first sight, and an affectionate relationship springs up between him and you; unless you are that peculiar kind of Britisher who lives in a region as cold as the moon, or unless you are a stranger to love, and blind to the spiritual in homely form (p. 31).

And yet he does not look for a philosophy of life and conduct which would enable him to resist the influence of that deadening cold, and to bring forth from within himself the spiritual in the routine of life.

He acknowledges that—

> The maintenance of discipline, and the settlement of relations between the Hindus and the Mohamedans provide us with matter for our deliberations (p. 39).

And yet he does not see that the solution for his problem lies in a real study of the history and the tenets of these religions, which would unveil to him the similarity which he suspects must underlie them. Again, "the thing here they call *education* stinks in my nostrils," (p. 60) and yet he does not ask what kind of education built ancient India, and what makes Indian students "the gentlest, the most highly civilized, the most beautifully sensitive natures I have ever met". (p. 18)

In short he passes by the wisdom of the Rishi and the Sufi because he sees the ignorance of the sadhu and the moulana. Thus men like Richards miss the opportunity kind Karma brings; in them the ancient East remains submerged in the modern occident which has reared them.

Richards' personal religion had much of beauty, grace and truth in it—it makes for the charm of the book as of the man. He tried to live up to his belief, "never ostracize a man however much you may object to him". (p. 18.) He had a fine sense of reverence for life and he was strong in hope for India he loved. While he regretted that "what is now so beautiful will vanish" (p. 30) he believed that "India will remain; nay India will be revealed".

O.

The World of Epitomizations.—A Study of the Philosophy of the Sciences. By GEORGE PERRIGO CONGER. (Oxford University Press, London. 29*s.*)

This is in every sense of the word a weighty volume. Of its 600 pages there are but few which do not show an array of references to works of modern philosophers and scientists, and a simple calculation proves these to number 2,285. Great industry has gone to the making of this book and Dr. Conger records his indebtedness to many colleagues and students of Minnesota University in this connection. For the most part it is highly technical and some of it not easy reading. From the first page to the last we find no reference to Indian or other ancient philosophies, nor to mystic, occult, or theosophical literature—it is emphatically a modern production, the outcome of modern thinking and research, and yet.....the whole volume is an exposition of the Hermetic axiom "*As above so below*," and might have been written as an expansion of :–"From *Gods* to *men*, from Worlds to atoms, from a star to a rushlight, from the Sun to the vital heat of the meanest organic being—the world of Form and Existence is an immense chain, whose links are all connected. The law of Analogy is the first key to the world-problem, ..." (*The Secret Doctrine*, I,604)—words familiar doubtless to many readers of THE ARYAN PATH.

The author's argument is stated with admirable clearness and succinctness :

> The Universe is a vast system of systems which strikingly resemble one another in the details of their structures and processes. Among these systems, or realms, are matter, life, and mind. The structures and processes of matter, or the physical world, resemble those of life, or the organisms, and both matter and life resemble mind. But below, or beyond the realm of matter there appear to be three other systems also, by the similarities of their structures and processes, identifiable as realms. These are the realms of logic, number, and geometry-kinematics, constituting a great cosmic sub-structure just beginning to be known as such. The Universe, although it is not a mind, begins with structures and processes which are logical and culminates in structures and processes which are personal. Human personality, socially developed, is, thus far, the highest concentration, the most complete epitome of the universe.

In short, as we have learned otherwheres, "to become a Self-Conscious Spirit, the latter must pass through every cycle of being, *culminating in its highest point on earth in Man*". (*The S. D.* I, p. 192. Italics by the reviewer.)

Dr. Conger divides his book into two main portions, the first deals with the date of the natural sciences, cosmogonic, biotic and neuro-psychological realms, and in this the reader is, as it were, in the region of tangibilities and should find this part of the book rich with suggestive information. Division II treats of the data of logic, number and geometry-kinematics arranged in accordance with the hypothesis of epitomization, and here we are on less solid ground where we must truly be prepared to recognise that "thoughts *are* things". To appreciate the work readers versed in the terminology of modern theosophy must be prepared to translate conceptions into a new nomenclature. Thus we have "realms" of matter, life and mind divided into "levels" not planes, or subplanes, and we have "parallelisms" not rays. The structures characteristic of each of the "levels" will be called "Monads" and, according to the hypothesis developed in this book, all the monads of the various levels and realms exhibit significant resemblances in their characteristic structures and processes, "this may be called epitomization by analogy. Epitomization by parallelism differs somewhat from this". A significant statement. The author notes that the numbering of levels within a given realm "does carry some indication of evolutionary sequence—the numbering of monadic characteristics within a given level does not"; this is what, in the light of theosophy, we should expect.

From so lengthy a book, so packed with statements and references it is impossible to do more than select a very few striking sentences out of the many which might be paralleled with phrases from *The Secret Doctrine.*

1. "Here," says Dr. Conger, "we make the assumption that the tubes, or some corresponding distributions of energy, or some conditions which, in connection with material structures, appear as energy, exist in their own right at a level prior to that of electrons; although the possibility of building up such tubes of force from monads of a realm prior to the cosmogonic for the present must remain largely an assumption." For science, yes, but not for the student who appreciates that "Fohat hardens the atoms" *i.e.* by infusing energy into them and "electrifies into life, and separates primordial stuff or pregenetic matter into atoms". Neither are "tubes" of energies alien to the minds of any who have studied the subject of occult physics.

2. "In the monads of the new level, *i. e.* units of electric charge, the monads of this level, *i. e.* lines of force remain as constituents...Jeans is 'tempted to imagine' that lines of force play a part in atomic structure". And again "according to Schrodinger, an electron may be regarded as the limit of a set of vibrations". Here are adumbrations of approach to the Eastern doctrine of *tattva* and *tanmatra* and that very heterodox scientist, Sir. J. H. Jeans, might be tempted to study the *Vishnu Purana.*

3. "Problems connected with the genesis of astronomical bodies show surprising resemblances to problems of biology." "That astronomical bodies re-produce in bi-parental process has been maintained for nebulae by Gifford, and for stars by Lindeman and Bickerton." "In cases of bi-parental reproduction in the biotic realm, there are notable processes of reduction of the number of cromosomes in germ cells. Nothing of the sort is ordinarily suspected in astronomical bodies; but according to the hypothesis of epitomization, some facts in astronomy and chemistry which have no ready explanation may be set in parallelism with biological reduction." Again, after more detailed discussion of some of the chemical problems connected with the anomalous groups of the periodic table of the elements, we read :–"At any rate these *may* afford a parallelism with biological processes of formation, cleavage and growth of a fertilized egg." And so we are set thinking of some archaic phrases from early stanzas of the Book of Dzyan in which we learn of the Ray which "causes the Eternal Egg to thrill, and drop the non-eternal Germ, which condenses into the World Egg"; and later, when Fohat "hardens the atoms," "reflecting the 'Self-existent Lord' like a mirror, each becomes in turn a world".

When we pass to the Biotic Realm the author begins with "organic chemical monads" at one end of the scale and mounts to "Social Monads" at the other; and by "social monads" he intends human societies, National, Imperial, Federated States, and finally racial or continental civilisations! A wide net indeed, but "Father–Mother spin a Web, whose upper end is fastened to spirit,...and the lower one to its shadowy end, matter; and this Web is the Universe." It is nothing less than universal integrations to which Dr. Conger leads our thought. His reflections lead through ideals of Leagues of Nations to suggestions that the "life process in the earth must not be isolated from the rest of the cosmos but must be regarded as receiving impulses from life elsewhere". "The problem of Man's place in the universe is a problem of the adjustment of the most intricate structures, those of man's mind in Society, to the most inclusive structure of structures, the universe." Again "since the cosmic process comes to its epitome and focus in mind, in society, God, even if He is not a Mind but a Person 'in and by Himself,' is at least to be approached by us in ways that are intelligent, personal, and therefore social. Since the cosmic process culminates in such adjustments, the object of religion, although not an individuate person like one of us, nor a corporate person like one of our organizations, may be called a "Culminate Person"—which is surely something like

H. P. B. and which others have called "THE GRAND MAN". Therefore we learn with interest and expectation that Dr. Conger has another book in preparation which will treat of the ethics and philosophy of religion.

EDITH WARD

The Religion of Scientists. By C. L. DRAWBRIDGE. (Benn, London. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

This volume embodies the results of an enquiry recently undertaken by the Christian Evidence Society into the religious beliefs of scientists. Six questions were addressed to all the members of the Royal Society and the replies of two hundred of them are here carefully tabulated and analysed by the Editor of the work, Mr. C. L. Drawbridge.

Any undertaking of this type is obviously attended by formidable difficulties. A large number of those approached found the questions asked them to be too obscure to warrant a definite answer, while of those who replied the great majority expressed themselves in extremely cautious terms. In view of the character of the questionnaire it will be seen that this attitude was justifiable enough:

1. Do you credit the existence of a spiritual domain?
2. Do you consider that man is in some measure responsible for his acts of choice?
3. Is it your opinion that belief in evolution is compatible with belief in a Creator?
4. Does science negative the idea of a personal God as taught by Jesus Christ?
5. Do you believe that the personalities of men and women exist after the death of their bodies?
6. Do you think that the recent remarkable developments in scientific thought are favourable to religious beliefs?

Nevertheless the questions strike one as being on the whole well chosen; such shortcomings as they possess are in the main those that inevitably attach to all enquiries of this type; they cannot in the nature of the case be free from ambiguity. This lack of precision was, as one would expect, peculiarly distressing to those scientifically trained minds to whom the questionnaire was sent. Yet it was characteristic of them also that for the most part they failed to realise that although no strictly accurate replies were possible, their answers could yet serve to reveal a great deal about their attitude to the universe. For it is clear that they have a very definite *symbolical* significance: they go a long way to indicate the source of the individual's "life".

The general impression which one receives from this volume is that scientists as a class are not markedly illuminated men; they have paid a certain price for their extreme pre-occupation with the plane of objective fact. Further, in the case of a large proportion of those here represented, their work is so technical that—apart from the fact that they may lay claim to possessing highly disciplined intelligences—their ideas on the subject of religion would seem to have little more claim on our attention than those of, say, a businessman, an actor or a naval officer. The study of physics or biology may easily lead a man to a discerning appreciation of the fundamental religious problems; that of hydrography, metallurgy or hygiene is hardly likely to confer upon him any notable advantage in evaluating them.

It may be said in conclusion that the results of the enquiry go a long way to substantiate the view that the scientific materialism of the last century is to-day definitely losing its ascendancy—as will be apparent from the following analysis of the replies which were furnished to the questions enumerated above:

	Yes	*No*	*Doubtful*
1.	121	13	66
2.	173	7	20
3.	142	6	52
4.	26	103	71
5.	47	41	112
6.	74	27	99

LAWRENCE HYDE

Dṛg-dṛśya-viveka: An Enquiry into the nature of the "Seer" and the "Seen"; text, English translation, and notes. By SWAMI NIKHILANANDA. Sri Ramakrishna Asrama, Mysore. Re. 1.)

The little book emphasises the importance of Buddhi (reason) in the gaining of knowledge by means of philosophy. Every student of the Upanishads knows the stress laid in them on *Buddhi* as the highest controlling faculty of the mind. Just as the waking consciousness is the standard of judgment even of our dream-state and unconsciousnesses, so Buddhi, is the standard of discrimination between Sat and Asat, truth and non-truth.

We cannot measure the world otherwise than by a standard which lies in ourselves and to expound which is the aim of philosophy. The whole process of cognition is a graded one from authority through mysticism to full realisation in Buddhi, and therefore it is essential that the searcher after truth should make himself a fit instrument to receive the gradual enlightenment on this course. The Upanishads are very definite on this point; purity of life is necessary for the clear working of the higher faculties.

The Dṛg-dṛśya-viveka is a handbook of Vedānta study through the method of concentration (samādhi), for it is only by this that Brahman is realised. The enquiry into the nature of the one who sees and that which is seen (equivalent to a study of the relation between subject and object) proceeds in 36 Sanskrit slokas which after the manner of the verse-upanishads discusses the fundamentals of the Vedantic theory of cognition. A couple of very interesting stanzas deal with the nature of Māyā and with the various degrees of Samādhi.

When reading the little book one realises its enormous value and help for both Eastern and Western students of metaphysics. The Western scholar in his "scientific" enquiries usually finds himself in the two-fold danger, *viz.* of introducing separateness into the intrinsic unity of the "All" (Sarvam), and of neglecting the existence of the "soul" behind and within the phenomena, the presence of the eternal observer and enjoyer of the world of manifestation. Therefore a revival in modern garb and modern application of the Vedantic spirit is a decided advance towards a satisfactory, rational interpretation of this mysterious Universe of ours.

The handbook helps greatly to clear up our concept of *consciousness*, which since the re-assertion of analytical psychology (this being as a matter of fact only a variation of the venerable Brahmavidyā of old), has become the—often misused—password of metaphysics. It is analytical psychology which by the introduction of the unconscious self has found its way back to the "Tat tvam asi" of the Vedānta, and thus even the student of psychoanalysis will benefit from a study of the *Dṛg-dṛśya-viveka.*

W. STEDE

This Surprising World: A Journalist Looks at Science. By GERALD HEARD. (Cobden-Sanderson, London. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Gerald Heard is a propagandist for science, but it is a science of to-day, not of yesterday. Western science has in the past appeared proud to overbearing. But its pride, like that of many Western institutions, has of late years received a check; its fruits have been proved no less evil than good; even its basic assumptions have been questioned. In Mr. Heard's essay, as in the writings of such men as Drs. Singer and Needham, it may be discovered casting up its accounts, conducting an inquiry into its own shortcomings. If it has not yet found its soul, it may at least be found querying its psychology. Doubt has been cast not only upon its sufficiency but upon its claim to objectivity even in its own sphere, and Mr. Heard shows how in the effort at self-understanding it turns to a study of its own origins, its historical growth, hoping thereby to determine its subjectivity, and so define the more faithfully its final function and authority. A sketch of that history is what this essay mainly undertakes. It

is very condensed, and though one regrets that at times, for it leaves some issues ambiguous, it has on the other hand the imaginative appeal of the unencumbered outline sketch. The vital story of man, Mr. Heard holds, is the story of the development of his mind into ever-larger understanding, a widening scope of *significant* fact. The epochs of human thinking are all to be viewed as "stages in one unbroken enlargement of mind". It was never an easy process; the creative had to battle with the conservative tendency, the desire of more fearful minds to bind inquiry by their own limited presuppositions. The poetic solutions of myth and the "most fruitful" scientific hypotheses have alike "in their old age hardened into dogmas, and what was once a fine throw of speculation attempting to lasso new facts becomes a rigid band beyond which facts are not to be sought". Mr. Heard shows this occurring again and again through the ages, dynamic apprehension dwindling to dull assertion, dead myth driving man to creative science, dead science driving man to creative myth, forever escaping forward into new realms of the imagination. The great failure of science, he suggests, in its blind assurance of objectivity, has been its neglect of the subjective realm of psychology, leading necessarily to a mechanistic view of the universe humanly unacceptable because it denies human significance. To-day the scientist, driven by the emptiness of his own findings, has come full circle to the problem of his self-discovery, of a vision able to focus "the seer and the seen in one image". We are, says Mr. Heard, today on the brink of a great discovery, of man's perception "that his essential nature is a mind and the body is only its projection and also that the universe's essential nature is also a mind, and matter is only its projection".

There are those who may feel that Western science has gone a long way round to arrive at an ancient knowledge. The important thing is that it *is* arriving there, and along its own lines of discovery. That the acknowledgment should come from the pen of such a man as Mr. Heard is a significant fact. His essay, brief though it is, has a genuine liberating force—it marks him, as much as anything else he has written, as a man to be read.

GEOFFREY WEST

The Devil in Legend and Literature. By MAXIMILIAN RUDWIN. (Open Court Publishing Co., London. $3·00.)

This is a comprehensive treatise on the Devil whose adventures are described in a fascinating manner. It will become a book of reference. Not only do we learn about the origin and genealogy of the Devil, but acquire much information regarding his habits, tastes, disguises, amours, and the infinite number of names by which he has been known. The Devil's line of descent is clearly traced from the beginning of mankind to the present day, but so much information does the book contain, that the reader is apt to be bewildered.

The idea of the devil in the old Buddhist and Hindu theology is a purely metaphysical abstraction, an allegory of necessary evil. With the Christians, on the other hand, the myth has become a historical entity, the fundamental stone on which Christianity, with its dogma of redemption, is built. Each generation and nation has had its own particular devil, distinctive from all others, and indicative of the temperament and characteristics of the race. But in all the different nations of antiquity there was not one which believed more in a *personal devil* than do the Christians of the present day. Antiquity recognized no isolated, thoroughly bad god of evil. Pagan thought represented good and evil as twin brothers, born of the same Mother—Nature. At first the symbols of good and evil were purely abstract, such as Light and Darkness. Later they were identified with natural phenomena, such as Day and Night, the Sun and Moon etc. The ancient philosophers defined evil as the lining of

good: *Demon est Deus inversus.* But Satan never assumed an anthropomorphic shape until the creation by man of a personal God.

The following taken from H. P. Blavatsky's *The Secret Doctrine* (II,515-6) throws light on the subject:—

> Esoteric philosophy shows that man is truly the manifested deity in both its aspects—good and evil, but theology cannot admit this philosophical truth. Teaching the dogma of the Fallen Angels in its dead-letter meaning, and having made of Satan the corner-stone and pillar of the dogma of redemption to do so would be suicidal. Having once shown the rebellious angels *distinct from God and the Logos* in their personalities, the admission that the downfall of the *disobedient* Spirits meant simply their fall into generation and matter, would be equivalent to saying that God and Satan were identical. For since the LOGOS (or God) is the aggregate of that once divine Host accused of having fallen, it would follow that the Logos and Satan are one.
>
> Yet such was the real philosophical view of the now disfigured tenet in antiquity. The *Verbum*, or the "Son," was shown in a dual aspect by the Pagan Gnostics—in fact, he was a *duality*, in full *unity*. Hence, the endless and various national versions. The Greeks had Jupiter, the son of Chronos, the Father, who hurls him down into the depths of Kosmos. The Aryans had Brahmâ (in later theology) precipitated by Siva into the Abyss of Darkness, etc., etc. But the fall of all these Logoi and Demiurgi from their primitive exalted position, had in all cases one and the same esoteric signification in it; the *curse*—in its philosophical meaning—of being incarnated on this earth; an unavoidable rung on the ladder of cosmic evolution, a highly philosophical and fitting Karmic law, without which the presence of Evil on Earth would have to remain for ever a closed mystery to the understanding of true philosophy. . . .
>
> The identity of thought and meaning is the one thing that strikes the student in all the religions which mention the tradition of the fallen Spirits, and in those great religions there is not one that fails to mention and describe it in one or another form.

M. F.

Yoga:— International Journal for the Scientific Investigation of Yoga, Vol. I, No. I, October, 1931. (Editor and Publisher: Helmat Palmié, Harburg, Wilhelmsburg, Germany. 12·50 RM.)

This is an elaborately produced, large octavo volume containing contributions in German, English, French and Italian; also bibliographies of the works of Wilhelm Geiger and Arthur Avalon, and a list of the publications of the Pali Text Society. Most of the one hundred or so co-editors and collaborators are Germans and Indians. Amoy, Tokyo, Boston, Pisa and Paris have representatives, and there two in England. It is announced that five issues will appear annually comprising 600 pages.

Whatever the significance assigned to "Yoga," its scientific investigation necessitates experiment by specialists; and theoretical dispositions on the meaning of ancient texts, with which several articles are concerned hardly come within the declared purpose of this journal. But it appears from the investigations of the principal contributors that Yoga has become synonymous in the Kali Yuga, with psycho-physical practices and aims. The psycho-spiritual states of consciousness attained by ancient Brahmanic and Neo-Platonic Theurgy are apparently unknown to modern investigators. It is a significant commentary on the psychological condition of the human race to-day that physicians and psychologists identify hypnosis with *yoga* and expound the latter on the basis of psycho-analysis.

It is undoubtedly true that the magical powers of the Tantrics indicate a knowledge of physiology and anatomy and of will as an energy, of which Western science is absolutely ignorant; but it is also true that these powers are even more dangerous for man, psychically and spiritually than are invisible "rays" and high-voltage electrical currents, physically. Necromancy is now practised secretly and openly in all countries. Civilization is everywhere permeated by hypnotic suggestion and thought-transference. If "the scientific investigation of Yoga" becomes general and extends in the direction indicated by the main contents of this journal, our modern races are likely to experience a Nemesis similar to that which is said to have overtaken the mythical Atlanteans.

W. W. L.

My Diaries: 1888–1914. By WILFRID SCAWEN BLUNT. (Martin Secker, London. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

Western civilisation to-day stands discredited by the Great War; it is not any longer held up to our esteem as the culmination of human effort and a pattern for the rest of mankind. Before the war, however, there were but few who entertained serious misgivings about it. To that small and distinguished company belongs Wilfrid Scawen Blunt.

The nineteenth was a century pre-eminently of colonial expansion. European nations, then in the hey-day of their power penetrated into every region of Asia and Africa, and sought to establish their dominion in sharp rivalry, enslaving or exterminating the original inhabitants. Dictated by economic motives as this policy was in truth, it was defended as Blunt points out—on the theory that "Evolution" required the "survival of the fittest": the weak must give way to the strong; Nature, they said, had ordained it. To Blunt this appeared an immoral and suicidal delusion. He abhorred the contention that a people who happened to be at a disadvantage from a military point of view deserved in consequence to be swept off the face of the globe. However seemingly backward a nation may be, he felt that it had distinctive and precious gifts which it ought to be allowed to cultivate unmolested.

His "Diaries," accordingly, record the activities in which he engaged and the controversies into which he was led in the endeavour to arrest European aggrandisement. Being an Englishman, he was concerned first of all with those lands where British power was extending itself; and as he had first hand knowledge of Egypt, that concern took the form mainly of opposition to the Egyptian policy of the British Government. The Occupation was effected in 1882 as a measure of temporary necessity, but in the next few years it became evident that the Conservative Government and Lord Cromer, their agent, had really no intention of yielding possession of the country: Egypt was to be made part of the Empire. To obtain a reversal of this policy Blunt applied all his time and energy, but his object was not achieved until after the war, and owing to causes with which he had personally nothing to do.

It may be thought presumptuous of a private individual to hope to alter national policy on issues of major importance, but Blunt was a member of the ruling class in an age when English affairs were largely in the hands of a group of aristocratic families, and enjoyed, therefore, exceptional opportunities of influencing personages in high office. He moved intimately in a circle which included most of the leading figures in politics, society, literature and journalism—a fact which lends additional interest to these Diaries and renders them invaluable for a study of the period which they cover and the personalities who played a prominent part therein. Theosophists would be particularly interested to note a conversation with Yeats in which the Irish poet menioned H. P. B. as one of three persons who had most deeply impressed him with power, the other two being William Morris and Henley.

K. S. SHELVANKAR

Freedom of Will. By N. O. LOSSKY, Translated by Natalie Duddington. (Williams & Norgate, London. 6*s.*)

Bergson has expressed his view that freedom of will is a fact of our experience, but—from the very fact that we *are* free—not one we can explain by concepts. Professor Lossky does not agree, and has tried to develop a system of concepts to express Free Will.

He visualises a "Kingdom of God" where the most intimate communion is possible between independent agents (his explanation of Intuition), and a kingdom of enmity based on repulsion between the elements. The upward way to the Kingdom of Heaven is hard, and cannot be found by merely willing it. Man's purpose is to renounce his limitless formal freedom, choosing the good voluntarily and finally acquiring "positive material freedom in God".

So far as this picture accords with the decree of Karma—in the words of H. P. Blavatsky (*S. D.* I, 643) "absolute Harmony in the world of matter as it is in the world of Spirit"—the author carries the reader with him. But is not his assumption of a God endowed with personality a basic flaw? Has he thought to test his ideas by the teaching of Eastern wisdom? For, as he himself admits, his theory only partially succeeds. It has an air of mechanism, though he is fully aware of the danger.

However, it must be admitted that the author's system of metaphysics (he calls it "concrete ideal-realism") has a special value if only because it asserts the dynamic creative power of the self. We are not the slaves of our character, but we create our character and to some extent our body. The self, in fact, is a super-temporal, super-qualitative entity not dominated by its body, the external world, its own character, or its past. All these may be the occasions of action, but they are not actual causes. Moreover this metaphysic leads the author to a conception, which we should have liked him to develop, of something like reincarnation.

It should be mentioned that four chapters of the book are devoted to examining arguments used against Free Will and to showing the weakness of theories of Determinism and Free Will such as those of Hobbes, T. Lipps, Luther, Schopenhauer and Windelband. Systems of this type involving Determinism fail because they do not throw full responsibility on man for his moral actions.

G. W. WHITEMAN

Temple Bells. By A. J. APPASAMY (Association Press, Calcutta. Rs.2 8as.)

Dr. Appasamy who is a devoted Christian has served his religion well by collecting in this volume gems of Hindu thought, though they be of varying merit. The book is meant for his co-religionists, and is designed to meet the suggested need for a handy volume of selections from the religious literature of India for Christian readers. Naturally therefore, selection of the originals as well as selection of a particular translation among many are done from the Christian point of view. The Bishop of Madras in a foreword says:– "Some we shall at once recognize as true and helpful for our own religious life and worship. Others again will show us where the fuller revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ has enriched or superseded the groping of men." As a liberating influence among Christians the book is of value; as a true revealer of deep Hindu thought and feeling it is defective.

The motive and even plan of the volume can be profitably copied by other sects. Not a haughty toleration by one community of the faiths of sister communities, but a genuine appreciation of other faiths, by their study and understanding is the prime need of India.

E.

Other-World Stuff. By CHARLES J. WHITBY. (Rider & Co., London. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

The publishers call this book a "challenge to the dictum of Hegel that philosophy has nothing to do with other-world stuff". It protests strongly against the current scientific and philosophic neglect of super-sensuous intuition and Transcendent Reality. Dr. Whitby welcomes the philosophic leanings of the latest scientific cosmologies, such as those of Jeans, Eddington and Whitehead. He prophesies that they are the prelude to a regular Metaphysic or an experimental science of the Spirit. He affirms his faith in super-sensuous intuition and points to the ancient traditions of Egypt, Jerusalem, Greece and India as significant in this regard. His spiritual creed is a compound of Plotinus and Indian Advaita together with a faith in the vast possibilities of Magic. After the Indian tradition, he insists on moral equipment for research

into these mysteries. He conceives of the Absolute as the One, compact of the three "hypostases" of Intellect, Life and Being, but lying 'beyond' these distinct yet mutually implying aspects as their source. Corresponding to them in the Jivatman are the capacities of Intellect, Love and Will. Every human individual has intuitive powers, though they are discouraged at the present day by the arrogant agnosticism of official science and philosophy. The aim of life is not merely knowledge but spiritual realisation—Moksha or Kaivalya. The author is a believer in the value and validity of the mystic attainment. He further affirms his belief in a heirarchy of higher powers—devas, aerial spirits, siddhas or perfected souls. He inclines to the spiritist hypothesis with regard to spiritualistic pheonomena. He prophesies that if this experimental Metaphysic of the Spirit is not taken seriously, the present "Babylonian Civilisation" is doomed to crash.

The book is attractively written and affords many apercus into the spiritual and occult traditions of humanity. But a "challenge to J. Hegel" must be made of sterner stuff. Assertion and castigation are hardly persuasive methods. We must beard the lion in his own den. Intuition is to be established by philosophic analysis and synthesis; Spiritism or Magic by patient experimental evidence. The book is more literary than scientific.

M. A. VENKATA RAO

Civilization as Divine Superman. By ALEXANDER RAVEN. (Williams & Norgate, London. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

It is a tempting task for students of history to read into the rise and fall of civilizations the operation of "laws". The cycles of culture and racial power are in fact readily explained by the doctrine of Karma; but this is not the kind of law it is usually hoped to find. Mr. Raven, though not a convincing philosopher himself, shrewdly suggests that modern thought has made itself ridiculous by trying to read into history the laws of biological evolution. Bernard Shaw's Methuselahs are as fanciful as Nietzsche's supermen are inhuman. H. G. Wells, the apostle of evolution in history, only achieves the appearance of progress by minimizing the triumphs of former civilizations.

Mr. Raven's own theory is interesting though not really edifying. He believes that the superman is not a vision of the future—he is already with us. Civilization is itself the divine superman. It springs into being as soon as agriculture enables surplus "capital" in the shape of food to be accumulated in large quantities. The new community, as distinct from barbaric nomad tribes, becomes a super-organism capable of growth, life and death, in a similar way to cellular organisms. And just as elements integrating to compounds follow different laws to protoplasm integrating to micro-organisms, so laws of a new type have to be sought for the super-organisms of civilization. They represent a higher integration than biology encompasses.

By applying this theory to the whole range of history, from Sumerian to modern U. S. culture, the author traces out various cycles—political, economic, social, linguistic, religious and artistic. Each cycle covers on an average 2,000 years. And in each of the different phases of the cycle a different code of morality will apply, based on the service exacted by the superman. However much Mr. Raven may argue that his theory gives religion a higher meaning by "rationalising" it, the impression remains that no conception of this type will make a religion of Communism, while the older religions such as Christianity and Buddhism are very seriously debased by it. This book contains many useful historical summaries, charts, and dates showing some of the cyclical aspects of civilization. But for a sounder rationale of the subject it would be preferable, as suggested above, to grasp the workings of Karma, which explains the cycles of historical civilizations as due to the inherent dynamic effect of actions either individual or communal.

G. W. WHITEMAN

FROM PARIS

A PLEA FOR INTOLERANCE

[**J. B.** is a French gentleman whose outlook is cosmopolitan. He is dissatisfied with the world, because he loves humanity. Once every quarter he will write for THE ARYAN PATH and tell us—how the world looks as it reflects itself in the mirror of Paris.—EDS.]

When visiting an Oriental museum, the "man in the street" seldom fails to express his astonishment at the fearsome and angry aspect of many Hindu and Buddhist deities. Christianity has not been guiltless of bloodshed, yet its images are always of a meek and gentle demeanour; how cruel then must those Asiatic religions be, whose gods signify their wrath in the very presence of their worshippers! It is replied that whether or not they are survivals of a time when the deity was conceived as a being to be dreaded rather than loved; or whether or not they symbolize aspects of divinity; they certainly do not represent "devils," but, on the contrary, friendly spirits who drive away the evil forces and destroy whatever might retard the progress towards the better. Should we not learn from them that destruction is the necessary counterpart of creation, and that nothing can be built up until much is pulled down and even rooted out?

Toleration is the slogan of the age. Christians have discovered it as a virtue when intolerance was no longer in their power; other people, who have no definite belief, are sincerely anxious to understand views which are not their own. But we surely push toleration too far. We take such pains to spare and respect not creative forces but dead carcases, inert remnants of what were once inspiring ideas; nowadays they simply block the way to human betterment. Had we done our best to remove them in time, we might have been spared the recent war. Fourteen years after its conclusion, who could pretend it was anything else than an appalling calamity? Yet the same disaster will overtake us if we do not, each in our own sphere, set out to deal with what has become a living problem for one and all. Might that not be considered as the spiritual and religious duty of our age? Some will say that this is taking a materialistic view of religion: if our stand-point is lofty enough, no human suffering, no destruction of life is of any consequence; if religions had not led to the betterment of earthly conditions, where should we be?—Still murdering each other in the primeval fashion. What is the use of hankering after a greater spirituality if we still allow collective murder a legal and—in all but a very few minorities—a moral recognition? Materialistic

our generation certainly is, and can no more help it than it could change climate. We must make the best of the "spiritual frost" (if I may so call it) of the present time. I put it then, that the problem of war is a pressing one, and should be considered first by all who are interested in spiritual progress. Will toleration help us to deal with it?

We have become much too respectful of old beliefs, obsolete rites, unintelligible scriptures, empty shells of all sorts. Religions, of course, are not the only obstacles to human betterment and to a new spirituality, but they are among the worst. What can we now hope to gain from them? They may indeed be "known by their fruits".

I remember, during the war, asking a fellow-soldier who was a Catholic priest how he could reconcile his faith with his duty as a soldier which undeniably consists in killing as many of his fellow-men as possible. He answered with the usual quotation "Give to Cæsar" &c., and also named many saints, like Saint Martin, who had been soldiers by profession. A student of Theosophy likewise quoted to me the beginning of the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, where the objections of Arjuna are allayed by the divine teacher: nothing can really be killed, therefore he may unconcernedly proceed to fight and slay his own kith and kin. Or I might have been referred to that noble aphorism "Teach to eschew all causes; the ripple of effects thou shalt let run its course," of which we read a beautiful commentary in the May number of THE ARYAN PATH (p. 363). This argument indeed has a deeper appeal. But surely war is not only an effect; it is, still more, a potent cause of far-reaching evil, and we cannot get away from our present responsibility, like the Christian who is content to say that it is God's will.

Sacred books being always capable of numerous interpretations, it might be replied that my informants had misunderstood their teachings. But that, we contend, is the very danger of religious authority. That which has many contradictory meanings has no meaning at all. *Were it not safer to close all the sacred books for a while, and act simply according to the lights of our conscience?* We owe much to them, yet we have outgrown them. There is no crime for which a precedent or a condonation may not be found in books composed two thousand or more years ago. I grant that the inner self of man does hardly change, but the outer circumstances do; if we disregard them, we are trying to grow excellent seed in an unsuitable soil. An instance of this we have in the general attitude of the Catholic Church towards "social" reforms (of course there are a few—very few—exceptions). Feeding the poor and tending the sick was for many centuries the privilege of the Church and her divine mission. Nowadays we begin to perceive that poverty and disease might to a great extent be rooted out; but there the Church is no longer with us, for it is written "The poor ye shall have with you always" . . .; it is a sinful error to hope for a fairer world or for anything else than what always has been, etc. Every yearning for human betterment meets with the same discouraging response from the Churches, especially, of course, from those where traditionalism reigns supreme, or which represent the majority in any particular country. Catholics in France, Lutherans in Germany, Anglicans in England are the fiercest nationalists and militarists. Did they not, during the war, all urge the combatants to "serve God and their country" a truly impossible and scandalous conjunction of ideals—and loudly call on the same God to destory their enemies, a spectacle that would be highly ludicrous if it were not so gruesome? In every country the same good Christians are the die-hard conservatives, the zealous patriots, the supporters of the army, those who hate, despise, or at the best, ignore all the rest of mankind, who oppose any reform and poopooh every generous effort. When I tax these people with narrow-mindedness, I may seem to have wandered to the very opposite of my initial proposition.

I should explain how I came to plead for intolerance.

Just about the time when THE ARYAN PATH was founded, we heard of many movements all tending to universal toleration and mutual understanding. THE ARYAN PATH itself declares its object to be that of: (1) forming nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity; (2) studying ancient and modern religions; (3) investigating the unexplained laws of Nature. This last object is excellent in itself, though we have not yet found the Francis Bacon who will give us the *Novum Organum*, the appropriate method to carry out those investigations. No. 2 inspires us with many misgivings, as we tried to explain above. Sacred books are a positive danger, and those who rely on them for guidance do more harm than good. *They* will never help us to get nearer to No. 1, the Brotherhood of Humanity.

It is not always unprofitable to ponder over "what might have been". The responsibility of Theosophists in the last war is small (*it will be greater the next time*); even if unwilling to adjust an unhappy karma by a worse one, they could not have changed the course of events. But the Christian Churches? If they had enforced the commandment "Thou shalt do no murder" and their adepts to choose between soldiering and communion, what might not have happened? Hardly more perhaps than a slight disorganisation of the opposing armies; for a few thousand men a more merciful and more useful death than they afterwards met at the barbed wire, and last but not least, the extreme decay of

Christianity would have become glaringly evident. But very probably it would have revived in the blood of the new martyrs and saved the world once again. However, nothing of the kind did take place. I do not know whether the conscientious objectors in England professed themselves Christians; those who were shot in France (all elementary-school teachers, I am told) were free-thinkers.* Christianity proved a miserable failure in the crucial moment; it stands condemned once for all, and it should be done away with, for it bars the way to better things. *Conscientious objectors, not Christian monks, are the saints of the twentieth century.*

In America was started two or three years ago a certain "Threefold Movement" to promote "Cultural Unity (the union of East and West); Human Unity (The League of Neighbours); Spiritual Unity (the Fellowship of Faiths). It certainly proceeds from pure and noble intentions, and I would not speak of it disparagingly. A branch had been formed in France, but its members were, I imagine, disappointed to find the activity of headquarters centred on the "fellowship of faiths" and the preparation of the "Parliament of Religions". Instead of attempting to reconcile religions which feel no desire at all of being reconciled, as was flatly stated in many of the replies received and published in their organ "*Appreciation*" would it not be a far more useful work, and better calculated to further the purpose of the Movement, to deal with the various religions according to their deserts, *not* in a reverent or "tolerant," but in a *critical* spirit? The urgent problems of the period call for energetic and *intolerant* action—needless to say I do not preach any kind of physical violence or material destruction! Instead of delving into this or that religion for gems of thought which may have been overlooked, let your best writers expose the failure of old beliefs to help us through our present miseries; let them urge seekers after "truth"—the truth of to-morrow, not that of yesterday—to put away incomprehensible gospels and to follow freely their conscience. Some "believers" will be won over to us, and the others may at last perceive how far they have strayed from the spirit of their Master.

J. B.

* Quite recently another conscientious objector, also a school-teacher, was given a fair trial and sentenced to four months' imprisonment. He was first committed to a mental specialist; a man of 27 who refuses to countenance wholesale patriotic murder being obviously a lunatic!

CORRESPONDENCE

DREAMS AND REINCARNATION

I note that you very kindly say that you welcome correspondence. Therefore, I venture to remark on one of the Dreams mentioned in the most interesting article on "Dreams of Future Events," by Mr. R. L. Mégroz in your May issue.

The dream I refer to is the one recorded by Mr. F. Greenwood in his *Imagination of Dreams*,—in which the dreamer dreams of a severed hand on a mantel-piece—and, on the following day calling at a certain house he actually sees on the mantel-piece of the room in which he is received, a mummied hand.

Does this dream present any difficulty to a believer in re-incarnation? Is it not more a dream of recollection than prophecy?—a recall to memory of some action in the past which made a deep impression on the Soul, the Store-house of memory.

Would not the emotion so strongly stirred in the Ego, freed during the sleeping hours—sensing the past as well as the future—communicate itself to the physical brain on its re-entry into the body; thus causing the dream of recollection. Are not incidents and seeming coincidents quite incomprehensible except through the reasoning of the tenet of re-incarnation, or re-embodiment?

Cornwall, England. C. E. HINDLEY SMITH

[Our correspondent and those who are interested in the subject of memory and dreams will find that the following extract throws great light on it. It should be read in conjunction with pp. 59–79 of *Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge* and also the U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 11 entitled Dreams.—EDS.]

The well-known fact—one corroborated by the personal experience of nine persons out of ten—that we often recognize as familiar to us, scenes, and landscapes, and conversations, which we see or hear for the first time, and sometimes in countries never visited before, is a result of the same causes. Believers in reincarnation adduce this as an additional proof of our antecedent existence in other bodies. This recognition of men, countries, and things that we have never seen, is attributed by them to flashes of soul-memory of anterior experiences. But the men of old, in common with mediæval philosophers, firmly held to a contrary opinion.

They affirmed that though this psychological phenomenon was one of the greatest arguments in favour of immortality and the soul's preëxistence, yet the latter being endowed with an individual memory apart from that of our physical brain, it is no proof of reïncarnation. As Eliphas Levi beautifully expresses it, "nature shuts the door after everything that passes, and pushes life onward" in more perfected forms. The chrysalis becomes a butterfly: the latter can never become again a grub. In the stillness of the night-hours, when our bodily senses are fast locked in the fetters of sleep, and our elementary body rests, the astral form becomes free. It then *oozes* out of its earthly prison, and as Paracelsus has it—"confabulates with the outward world," and travels round the visible as well as the invisible worlds. "In sleep," he says, "the astral body (soul) is in freer motion; then it soars to its parents, and holds converse with the stars." Dreams, forebodings, prescience, prognostications and presentiments are impressions left by our astral spirit on our brain, which receives them more or less distinctly, according to the proportion of blood with which it is supplied during the hours of sleep. The more the body is exhausted, the freer is the spiritual man, and the more vivid the impressions of our soul's memory. In heavy and robust sleep, dreamless and uninterrupted, upon waking to outward consciousness, men may sometimes remember nothing. But the impressions of scenes and landscapes which the astral body saw in its peregrinations are still there, though lying latent under

the pressure of matter. They may be awakened at any moment, and then, during such flashes of man's inner memory, there is an instantaneous interchange of energies between the visible and invisible universes. Between the "micrographs" of the cerebral ganglia and the photo-scenographic galleries of the astral light, a current is established. And a man who knows that he has never visited in body, nor seen the landscape and person that he recognises, may well assert that still has he seen and knows them, for the acquaintance was formed while travelling in "spirit". —H. P. BLAVATSKY (*Isis Unveiled*, I. 179-180)

EAST AND WEST

The difference which exists between India and Britain is mainly one of values and for that reason it can be reconciled.

If we look back over the past fifty years we see that an interchange has been taking place between these countries but it has been uneven because, in the process, the Indian has parted with his stock to make way for the other fellow's goods which had glamoured him. Western science and its intense application to the amelioration of physical existence has been seized upon with avidity by many who assert that they represent New India. In this greed for Western progress the acquisitors have jettisoned much of their ballast,—the great inheritance from the past, that sublime philosophy which an increasing number in the West, are beginning to recognise and absorb. Briefly, the new culture in India is even more intrigued by mechanisation than its originators. Although many Westerners have been attracted by Eastern wisdom only a few have studied and taken it up, while young India has vigorously taken to material science.

The great divide is actually caused by what each conceives of as life, as reality.

In the West it is understood as manifestation, "terra firma" so to speak, while the fact of all aggregations of matter being ephemeral is overlooked. In the East there is One Reality, the eternal, the cause of all manifestation, and earth is not firm by a moving whirligig of atoms. Thus we are confronted with certain definite contrasts in fundamental conceptions.

Take "Religion," for, under what is comprised by that term, there will be found a marked dissimilarity. In Great Britain the State religion is a form of Christianity with the dominant idea of the God transcendent; this Deity is regarded in various ways, as an abstraction, as a myth but more generally as an anthropomorphic personal God to be propitiated by individuals and conventionally worshipped once every week, if we leave out of account the comparatively few special occasions. The East recognises the God immanent; It is everywhere and always present.

But the widest part of the divide is to be found in the attitude towards death, for the dictum *Mors janua vitae* is in no wise a Western belief since it runs counter to "practical politics". Death is usually conceived of as "the End".

Vague references are made to a soul and various are the definitions of this nebulosity which is supposed to survive the body. But during the life of the latter it is relegated to a distance, presumably being present during religious observances and intercessory prayers. In some quarters, even the resurrection of the physical body is a belief which still persists.

Throughout the East, we find quite a different attitude towards death, frequently one that seems to denote a disrespect of earth-life, causing it to be held too cheaply and with comparative indifference. Followers of the Buddha almost invariably associate "liberation" with release from physical existence. While in parts of India the attitude towards physical life is marked by resignation, indifference or detachment, further East it fails to detract from a joyous racial psyche.

It is easy to trace from this difference in outlook the cause of diversity in temperament which again gives rise to a lack of sympathetic understanding between

the different races of East and West. But when we come to consider the ethical side and classify virtues, we find that the Western order of merit is very nearly completely reversed; for India does not accord pride of place to those which Westerners look upon as cardinal.

In the Christian West Truth and Honesty are regarded as pre-eminent, but is this so in actuality? Can it truthfully be said that every party newspaper is exempt from "suppressio veri" and "suggestio falsi"? and again has integrity of purpose entirely superseded hypocrisy? Surely a pharisaical attitude is as much to be deprecated as a casual lack of exactness oftentimes introduced to please or placate. "Faith, Hope and Charity but the greatest of these is Charity" is a Christian dictum, but it is in India and further East that it is so apparent in the lives of the people.

Unquestionably there are indications of a better understanding. Insularity and a crystallised mental outlook are much less in evidence than formerly. The war uprooted much of what prevailed but the plant was not entirely eradicated.

The tentacles of the material octopus are very tenacious though some have been cut off. New India might be careful lest those remaining do not get a strangle hold on her.

London M. R. ST. JOHN

THEOSOPHY AND SCIE`CE

Readers unversed in the philosophy of Theosophy would gain very erroneous ideas from the article in the March ARYAN PATH on "Physics, Philosophy and Theosophy" by Philip Chapin Jones.

The philosophy of Kant may indeed provide an interpretation of modern conceptions of physics, but it misses the Theosophical view-point. This is pointed out in the Mahatma Letters: "Western critical idealism has still to learn the difference that exists between the *real being* of supersensible objects and the shadowy subjectivity of the ideas it has reduced them to." (p. 194) The difference is indicated in the same letter in the word in parenthesis in the phrase "system of pure (materialistic) reason".

"Space is not something real," says Mr. Jones, but H. P. B. (*The Secret Doctrine*, commentary on Stanza I, p. 35) wrote: "Space is the *one eternal thing* that we can most easily imagine, immovable in its abstraction and uninfluenced by either the presence or absence in it of an objective Universe." (*cf.* Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, part 1, section 1, 4, a). The words italicised are important because Theosophical.

Again: "time is merely the form of our external perception". But the whole Cosmos is a gigantic chronometer," says K. H. (*Mahatma Letters*, p. 193).

"Philosophy in the work of Kant, thus corroborates Theosophy." Perhaps! From a "human-plane-of-consciousness point of view"; but hardly from a "strictly philosophical" one. True philosophy would take account of illusion in the Theosophical sense.

Relativity is not the last word. Though he has abandoned his "curved space" Einstein clings to relativity. He may in his search for truth abandon even that which made him famous. But whether he does or not Theosophy must reject relativity, *as stated*. The careful perusal of the first few paragraphs of H. P. B.'s Psychic and Noetic Action might not be unprofitable to Theosophists anxious to square Theosophy with ephemeral scientific and philosophic (so called) theory.

There are other statements in the article to which exception can be taken, but the foregoing will suffice.

May I trust that this comment of mine will be accepted as coming from an onlooker anxious to see his side win.

Hamilton, Canada. CECIL WILLIAMS

[Is our correspondent sure that he has grasped all the aspects of the teachings on these topics put forward in *The Secret Doctrine*? Further, has he really understood the view-points of our original contributor? However, we will leave it to Mr. Jones if he deems it necessary, to clear up Mr. Williams's doubts.—EDS.]

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"————————*ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."

HUDIBRAS.

Sir Denison Ross reminded us in the *Observer* of 5th June of the centenary of the birth of the author of *The Light of Asia*. Theosophists more than others owe a debt of gratitude to Sir Edwin Arnold, for he served their cause, albeit unconsciously to himself. H. P. Blavatsky thought of *The Light of Asia* as worthy of being used with the *Gita*, and in her will expressed a wish that if her death anniversary was to be observed readings from these two volumes should be used. Then, Arnold said that "he loved India and Indian peoples," and he served them perhaps in the noblest way they could be served in that epoch. He dived in the vast ocean of Indian literature, and diving deep emerged with some splendid pearls. Of them he strung his *Islam's Rosary*, with them he fashioned *A Casket of Gems* and built *An Indian Temple*.

He was a pioneer and began expounding Indian thought, feeling and sentiment when the philologists were immersed in the task of translating Asiatic texts. The western public was ignorant of eastern wisdom, when in 1879 he lit the lamp of the law and held aloft his *Light of Asia*. The life and doctrines of Gautama were not known when the book was published, and became so very popular. Even to-day it maintains its attraction though in a somewhat restricted circle, which by no means is small, of Buddhists and Theosophists. Though many lives of the Enlightened One have been written, in the English tongue, *The Light of Asia* deservedly holds its own and continues to evoke response in many a reader of lofty mind and intuitive heart.

To some students of the Theosophical doctrine of Reincarnation the life of Sir Edwin Arnold offers a good subject for study. Here was a man born in England, who even in his Oxford days carried away the Newdigate prize in 1852 by his poem "Belshazzar's Feast," in which the oriental in him was at work. Four years later he came to Poona as the Principal of the Deccan college, and spent some six years breathing the wonderful atmosphere of India. Another great but a different type of Englishman, Mountstuart Elphinstone, was the Governor, then old in the service of his country as Arnold was young. Enthusiastically the professor turned learner and took up the study of Sanskrit, Persian and Turkish. Many have started on

a similar venture, with some enthralling end in view but gave way before the hard work involved in mastering oriental languages; others kept up and utilized the results for various purposes; Sir Edwin was one of the very few indeed whose Karmic, or shall we say Skandhaic, tendencies asserted themselves, and brought out from within the invisible astral cells and corpuscles, some memories, some promptings, some reactions of an anterior past. His case brings to our minds that of a great Theosophist, W. Q. Judge. A few months' stay in India, during which he developed some contacts, matured others, and returned to New York to sow the seeds he took away from this country; he laboured intelligently and faithfully and there grew a fine Banyan which sheltered and shelters to this day many pilgrim-souls of a variety of calibre and understanding. Similarly, though on a different plane, Sir Edwin Arnold: returning to London an 'accident' occurred; he had fully intended to come back to his loved oriental studies; but it happened that he answered a chance advertisement, and before he knew it, he was a leader-writer in the *Daily Telegraph* which then began to convey the scents and carry the spices of the Orient to many an English home. This Englishman, born and bred a Christian, who not only aroused respect for the Buddha throughout the West, but kindled the fire of devotion to the Great One in not a few hearts in Christendom failed to make any impression when he rendered into verse the life of Christ and called it *The Light of the World*. In spite of this experience, a group of Bombay Parsis planned to request Sir Edwin to write "*The Light of Old Iran*" but ere the scheme matured he died on the 24th of March 1904.

Not only with Asia but with Africa also Edwin Arnold had some Karmic links. It is not generally known that he was directly responsible for the arrangements of Stanley's journey to Africa to discover the course of the Congo, and that the celebrated explorer named after Arnold a mountain to the north-east of Albert Edward Nyanza. Again, it was Edwin Arnold who thought of the great trunk line traversing the whole of African continent, and he was the first to use the expression which Cecil Rhodes later popularized—"Cape to Cairo railway".

We mentioned Mountstuart Elphinstone, the historian and statesman, who, according to the Duke of Wellington, ought to have been a soldier. But while his martial achievements are forgotten his educational work endures. Like Arnold's, Elphinstone's Karma brought him the opportunity of serving the cause of western education in India. The two men were so different: we do not know if Elphinstone ever tried to dig into the old mines of Indian Knowledge; he

was young when some leisure came his way in Nagpur in 1804–05 and he spent it in reading classical and general literature. At the same age of twenty-five in 1856–57 Arnold was busy learning oriental lore. But it was Elphinstone's educational work which opened the avenue of service for men like Arnold. These two served India not for personal profit but for the ideals they cherished. It is recorded by General Briggs that Elphinstone had gathered together Marathi books, a pile of them, and on being asked the purpose of such ammunition he replied—"to educate the natives, but it may be our high road back to Europe". It is to such men that Britain owes her real supremacy in India. They have become rare and rarer in modern decades, a fact which contains a lesson of first-rate political significance.

Mr. Lloyd George expressed some very Theosophical thoughts in a speech reported in the *Manchester Guardian* of 27th June, from which we extract:—

If Jesus Christ came back after 2,000 years what would He see? asked Mr. Lloyd George.

He would see the world still bleeding from the wounds of the most terrible war ever waged in the history of mankind, bleeding and almost on the point of starving, still engaged with all their might in perfecting weapons more destructive, more terrible, more shattering than any invented and utilised in the Great War. That is what He would find after 2,000 years of the reign of the Prince of Peace. He would find the followers of Jesus of Nazareth with their six-inch guns, their rifles, and their explosives. So far from brotherhood he would find the nations more imbued with suspicion of each other, with distrust, enmity, fear, revenge, and hatred than at any time in the history of the world.

You can see it in things great and small. If Jesus's parents had to fly with Him to-day from the wrath of Herod they could not start on their flight without a passport from Herod himself. On their arrival in Egypt they would be refused admission as alien immigrants, impecunious. That is the new spirit of brotherhood amongst nations after two thousand years of Christianity!

But all the spirit of Jesus has not been lost . . . . we have not yet reached the spirit of fraternity, the spirit of brotherhood. That is a thing we have got to work at. . . . . The full spirit of fraternity is the only thing that will save the world.

Have you noticed the reception given to President Hoover's message? But the French say: 'If you take away one-third of our guns, if you destory the mobility of our artillery, where are we? We are at the mercy of the Germans.' Security? Brothers do not ask security against each other. Therefore it is a question entirely of changing the spirit of mankind.

ॐ

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light ! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. III — SEPTEMBER 1932 — No. 9

FIFTY YEARS OF PSYCHICAL RESEARCH

The fiftieth anniversary of the foundation of the Society for Psychical Research, which is being celebrated this year, is an event which most readers of THE ARYAN PATH will greet with sympathetic interest. Founded in 1882, the primary object of the S. P. R. was to make " an organised and systematic attempt to investigate that large group of debatable phenomena designated by such terms as mesmeric, psychical, and spiritualistic". Its aim, according to the preliminary Manifesto, was "to approach these various problems without prejudice or prepossession of any kind, and in the same spirit of exact and unimpassioned inquiry which has enabled science to solve so many problems, once not less obscure nor less hotly debated".

During the half century that has followed the formulation of these excellent intentions, the S. P. R. has had the support of a succession of able, conscientious, and enthusiastic members, who have devoted in the aggregate an enormous amount of time and energy to furthering its objects. The result of their labours is embodied in whole libraries of Proceedings and other books, which contain a truly impressive collection of well-attested and classified facts in connection with abnormal psychic happenings. In the face of this mass of evidence, only the wilfully blind and prejudiced materialist will still venture to challenge the reality of the phenomena in question.

But our unstinted admiration for this aspect of the Society's work must not blind us to the fact that, beyond the accumulation of data, it has achieved very little indeed; and the reason is not far

to seek.

Just as there were many heroes before Agamemnon, so were there many explorers of the mysteries of the human mind and soul before Mr. F. W. H. Myers and his colleagues. Psychical science was not born in 1882. On the contrary, it is the oldest of all the sciences, its origins being hidden in the darkness of the far past. In every age and race it has had its students and its expert professors; and its broad principles have been handed down through the generations, both in writing, and, more especially, by oral tradition. But, because this ancient knowledge was not to be found set forth in orderly text-books, and perhaps also because it was difficult for Western scholars in 1882 to admit that men of "inferior races," and in the so-called pre-scientific era, could have known anything worth while, the founders of the S. P. R. set aside all the traditional wisdom of occultism as being unworthy of their attention; and decided to tackle the subject *de novo*, using only the methods by which such striking results had been arrived at in the *physical* sciences during the preceding two hundred years.

This was their deliberate choice, for, had they been willing, they might have had the co-operation of Eastern psychologists. In her magazine, *The Theosophist* H. P. Blavatsky hailed the formation of the S. P. R. in the following words:

> The new Psychical Research Society, then, has our best wishes, and may count upon the assistance of our thirty seven Asiatic Branches in carrying out their investigations, if our help is not disdained. We will be only too happy to enlist in this movement, which is for the world's good, the friendly services of a body of Hindu, Parsi and Sinhalese gentlemen of education, who have access to the vernacular, Sanscrit and Pali literature of their respective countries, and who were never yet brought, ... into collaboration with European students of Psychology. Let the London *savants* but tell us what they want done, and we will take care of the rest.

About the same time, one of H. P. Blavatsky's Masters wrote concerning the S. P. R.:

> Its work is of a kind to tell upon public opinion by experimentally demonstrating the elementary phases of Occult Science ..... We wish it well.

But the West ignored the East, and went its own way, unmindful of the crucial fact that psychical phenomena are different, not only in degree, but in kind, from physical phenomena, and are therefore not amenable to the same modes of investigation and study.

The method of physical research, in its quest for the laws that govern phenomena, is to observe facts, either occurring spontaneously in nature, or produced by experiment; to frame an hypothesis, which will explain them; and, finally, to test and confirm the hypothesis by further experiment. This method is valid so long as we can control our experiments, so long as their results are regular and invariable, given identical conditions. Physical phenomena have their genesis and field of action on the plane on which the senses and

brain-mind of the investigator operate: therefore he is competent to deal with them. But psychical phenomena only occasionally and spasmodically touch the physical world at all; just as a submarine may once in a while show traces on the surface of the sea by an escape of oil or bubbles of air. Their genesis and *modus operandi* are altogether outside the range of the ordinary man's perception. He may observe an abnormal psychic happening, but he cannot be sure of reproducing it experimentally. Indeed it is probably no exaggeration to say that not one psychic or spiritualistic phenomenon has ever been reproduced in exactly the same form during all the experiments and séances held under S. P. R. auspices since 1882. When it comes to explaining his facts the Psychical Researcher, who limits his methods to those of Western Physical Science, is in worse case still. He has either to admit complete ignorance, or to essay to use one class of phenomena, which he cannot explain, for the solution of problems still more obscure; as when the unaccountable possession of knowledge by mediums is set down to telepathy.

Inasmuch as the results of all investigations on S. P. R. lines are regular only in their irregularity, the hope of building up an *experimental* Psychical Science on the lines of the Physical Sciences must for ever remain a mirage. Before Psychical Research can be formulated as an experimental science, its professors must qualify themselves by learning the time-attested laws governing occult or inner states and energies, as well as the methods by which they are controlled. Without this qualification, they are in the position of a man who tries to study oceanography from a boat with no appliances for making observations below the surface: with it they would be like the same man equipped with instruments for dredging, sounding, and generally exploring the ocean bed.

Perhaps the most useful work of the S. P. R. and its sister Societies has been their demonstration to a wide circle of hitherto sceptical people of the reality of telepathy and certain other varieties of psychic phenomena, which, be it noted, were perfectly well known to and under the control of earlier psychologists. But while they have made telepathy a familiar word to the man in the street, they have not begun to understand how telepathy functions. As Mr. Hereward Carrington tells us in his *Story of Psychic Science*:

> .... Physical theories of telepathy have been abandoned of late years, and the question of its ultimate explanation has been left entirely open.

Of clairvoyance, he writes:

> It is most baffling, and the truth of the matter is that we have as yet hardly the faintest idea as to how clairvoyance may be said to operate....

And Mr. Carrington makes similar confessions of ignorance in respect of nearly every other type of psychical phenomenon.

Space does not allow more than a passing reference to the tragic blunder of the S. P. R. in accepting and promulgating Dr. Richard Hodgson's attack on the good faith of H. P. Blavatsky—an attack based on evidence which the defence were never allowed to see, and on the testimony of paid witnesses, after an "investigation," in which Dr. Hodgson acted as judge, jury, and counsel for the prosecution, and in which neither the accused nor any witness for the defence was invited to testify. This incident leaves a stain on the record of the S. P. R., which it is hoped may one day be removed by the withdrawal of Dr. Hodgson's Report.* A full account of this matter may be found in Mr. William Kingsland's recent pamphlet, *Was She a Charlatan?* and also in chapter V of *The Theosophical Movement, a History and a Survey.*

The S. P. R. does not differentiate between psychical phenomena deliberately produced by one who understands their *modus operandi*, and erratic manifestations through irresponsible mediums, because its members assume that there are none wiser in these matters than themselves. As they threw away a rare opportunity to study consciously produced phenomena, when they repudiated H. P. Blavatsky, they have naturally had to fall back on the investigation of the phenomena of Spiritualism, to which they have devoted an enormous amount of time and attention. During the course of the Society's history, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of séances have been held, and many celebrated mediums, have been subjected to the most elaborate and searching tests. Some prominent members have wholeheartedly avowed themselves converts to Spiritualism; while others are still uncertain if *any* of the physical phenomena of the séance room are genuine. As to the mental phenomena associated with mediumship, there seems to be

*We will take this opportunity to print a letter dated 15th May 1930 from Mr. W. H. Salter, Hony. Secretary of The S. P. R. in response to this suggestion from us :—

"Sir Lawrence Jones has shown to the Council of this Society your letter to him of the 28th April, concerning Madame Blavatsky and the report published by the Society with regard to her in 1884-5.

I think you are under some misapprehension as to the nature of the reports published by the Society in its *Proceedings*. In every Volume of the Society's *Proceedings* is printed a note to the effect that 'the responsibility for both the facts and the reasonings in papers published in the *Proceedings* rests entirely with their authors'. The criticisms therefore of Madame Blavatsky which were printed by the Society do not rest on the corporate authority of the Society, but on that of the individual investigator, in the particular case the late Dr. Hodgson.

Any action therefore of the kind you suggest would imply that the Society had accepted a responsibility for Dr. Hodgson's criticisms which it has never in fact accepted. This seems to be one of the many cases in which the best course is to await the verdict of posterity which, in arriving at a decision, will take into account not only adverse criticisms made of Madame Blavatsky during her life, but also any evidence which may have come to light since of a contrary kind."

fairly general agreement as to their reality, cases of fraud being of course excluded; but, when it comes to explaining them, agreement ends. It seems to be generally admitted that, when knowledge, which could not have been acquired by normal means, is displayed by a medium, such knowledge must in many, if not most cases, have been conveyed by the mysterious action of telepathy from the minds of the sitters to the subconsciousness of the medium. One school of investigators appear to be satisfied that all cases may be so interpreted, but others recognise the inadequacy of this explanation in a vast number of instances, and adopt the "spiritist hypothesis," despite the grave difficulties inherent in it.

It is a curious and regrettable thing that the Eastern Occult explanation of this important problem, which was given in *Isis Unveiled*, in 1877, and repeated in more detail in 1881 (*vide Fragments of Occult Truth* in *The Theosophist* for that year), does not appear to have been considered at all by S. P. R. workers. In the above and others of her writings, H. P. Blavatsky declared that mediumship is a pathological state, and she explained the psycho-physiological peculiarities of persons subject to it. She stated that when abnormal knowledge, displayed by a medium, is not derived from his (or her) own inner consciousness, or from the minds of the sitters, it comes nearly always from the "shells," or psychic *reliquiae* (not the spirits) of the dead. This explanation, which avoids the Scylla of Spiritualism on the one hand and the Charybdis of attributing impossibilities to telepathy on the other, affords a coherent and logical solution of such difficulties as the triviality or incoherence of most of the "messages," and the apparently dream-like condition that has been noted in so many of the "communicators"; and yet official Psychical Research does not so much as discuss it!

That there is, however, a tendency on the part of at least some members of the S.P.R. to adopt a deeper and wiser view of the whole subject, and to recognise that Man is not only physical and psychic, but is essentially an intellectual and spiritual being, is evinced by an article in the *Contemporary Review* for June, on *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the S.P.R.*, by Dame Edith Lyttleton, who says:—

I am of course only expressing my own opinion when I say that the solution of many perplexities lies in a clearer understanding of the supernormal powers of the human mind, for these may prove to be the link between ourselves in this life and ourselves in the next stage of life . . . . . Too much stress has perhaps been laid on evidence of survival and too little on evidence of qualities and power which transcend the body here and now and would seem to indicate "the continuity of existence".

INDIA AND OBJECTIVE REALITY

I

[**J. W. T. Mason** wrote in this journal in August 1930 on "The Paths of India, China and the West". Since then he has been visiting the eastern countries. Some members of our staff had the benefit of his views on the present Indian conditions, during his stay in Bombay. His views and estimates are worth the serious thought of the scholar and the statesman alike; for, not only through their books but also through personal contact with Henri Bergson, Benedetto Croce and F. C. S. Schiller our author has acquired a philosophic insight, which he applies to all practical problems. In sending this article he writes to us from Japan:—

It contains conclusions forced on me during my studies in India, China and Japan, in the course of which I have been in communication with many of the principal leaders of the three countries. It is not possible to treat the Orient as a whole. There is no eastern cultural unity. You in India have a cultural affinity with us in the West and Japan has a materialistic affinity with us but China has no affinity at all with the Occident. Therefore I have treated in detail only India.

We had an opportunity of discussing this article with a friend of THE ARYAN PATH, and of India; at our request he has written his comments which follow the article.—EDS.]

When it is said that the West is vitally affecting the lives of the peoples of the East, what is meant? To interpret Western influence simply in terms of political freedom is to go astray in reaching a proper conclusion. *The West is affecting the desires of the East because in the West there are higher standards of living for the people and more material comforts.* Political freedom is nothing in itself. Political freedom, where it is successful, always is the outcome of a desire for material betterment and is always coupled with the discipline and technical ability required to create improvements in human welfare.

There is no record in history of a people first winning and holding their political freedom and secondly developing a desire for better conditions of living. The desire for betterment comes first; then comes political freedom. Political freedom never is self-supporting. If the people, once they have secured political freedom, have not the competence to create higher material benefits for themselves, inevitably freedom lapses and there is political degeneration. So invariably does history record this fact that one may accept it as a law of creative life.

To find the trend of national consciousness do not go to the politicians in the Orient if you wish to discover whether the East is really being affected by the West. Rather seek to know whether the people are becoming fundamentally interested in improving their earthly existence; whether they earnestly want better homes and more expansive ways of living and whether they have the determination to apply themselves to the necessary study and acquire the necessary discipline and co-operation without

which the comforts of life for the people at large are unattainable.

In other words, *the influence of the West emphasises the necessity for developing a philosophy of objective reality.* It may not be a self-conscious philosophy, definitely worked out—though that can be done—but the people, as a whole, must consider the material world as real and must respect their individualities as real.

This is the foundation of Western culture. In that respect there is a single Occidental influence which is offered the East. There is not, however, any one culture characteristic of the East, taken as a whole. The three great countries of the East are India, China and Japan. Their cultures, their ways of life, their mentalities differ fundamentally. India has followed a spiritual evolution; China has followed an aesthetic evolution; Japan has followed an evolution uniting spirituality and aestheticism with utilitarianism. It is not possible, therefore, to examine Western influence on the East, as a single problem. Japan is accepting Western principles of material progress because of a natural inclination toward utilitarianism. China is floundering helplessly, under the control of self-seeking politicians, facing the impossible task of trying to develop political freedom before economic freedom.

In India, the problem is far more complex than in Japan or China. The Japanese temperament is not metaphysical. Realism has always been accepted by the Japanese. One hears much these days of the mysticism of Zen Buddhism, which is an active force only in Japan. But, the Zen priesthood is intensely realistic; and it was Zen priests who led the development of Japan's overseas trade during the Ashikaga period, the priests being themselves commercial and financial advisers to the Japanese governing class and naming their trading ships after some of the great temples. That spirit of practicality is still very much alive in Zen.

China has tended toward metaphysics, but largely as a verbal pastime, not intent on creating new ideas. Confucianism, which seeks a static condition of society and provides rules for conduct, does not encourage creative mentalities. Intellectual adroitness, in metaphysics, has been the Chinese ideal. The desire has not been to gain results but to toy with words and phrases, in aesthetic admiration of what metaphysics can do. It is doubtful whether China really wants Western material progress. The Chinese show evidence of so much self-satisfaction and so much certainty that they are superior to all other peoples, that it is impossible to predict whether China will modernize herself for at least generations to come.

In India, it is different. Hinduism has given to the world the highest philosophic conceptions of Ultimate Reality the human mind has ever attained. It seems impossible to doubt that Ultimate

Reality is subjective or is of a nature even deeper than subjectivity. At least it is not objective nor materialistic. I believe Hindu thought has shown this very clearly and Western science is now moving to the same conclusion. Yet, we do not refuse to build a bridge because the iron and wood used to construct it have no ultimate reality of their own. We do not say: "wood and iron are only centres of energy called electrons without material basis, so why build a bridge and be under the illusion that it is real?"

What we do is to make the bridge and if it bears our weight and permits us to cross the torrent beneath, it is real enough for us. That is the method of the West. The method in India, to draw an extreme example, would be to suppress the desire to cross the torrent and so not build the bridge. The desire would be considered only an illusion and by overcoming the illusion, one would gain in spiritual enlightenment. I say this is an extreme case, but it is fundamentally true; and it illustrates the grave difficulty facing India's inquiries into Western culture.

Ultimate Reality is not objective. But, there is an Objective Reality, nevertheless; and by the Western way of thinking, it is not to be avoided nor suppressed. Rather, it is to be expanded and made ever richer and more varied. To seek to move back from Objective Reality into the subjectivity or "super-subjectivity" of Ultimate Reality, while trying at the same time to adopt Western ways of progress is impossible.

I believe India's troubles to-day are due more to a misunderstanding of this fact than to anything else. Ultimate Reality, as worked out in Hinduism, is a magnificent conception. Objective Reality, as worked out in the West through the means of practical creative action, is no lesss magnificent, and perhaps is the greater triumph of the self-conscious mind.

During my journey through India last January and February, I met leaders and followers of every class. Two impressions more emphatic than others were left with me. *First, there is an unfortunate belief among India's young men that Western ways of thought are mechanistic. It is not sufficiently understood that what the West has gained in human benefits has been the result of intense struggle, of hard work, of self-imposed discipline. Second, there is little desire among the leaders of India to move outside the realm of phrases and get to work.* I think the second attitude is based on the first. It is a grave mistake for India to keep constantly harping on Western mechanism. It is true that the West will have to adopt other ways of life and will have to take into its own culture the knowledge of Ultimate Reality which India has contributed to spiritual philosophy. But, that is the West's own problem. The problem for India is to see the creative power which the West has put into its life to the

benefit of material welfare. India thinks too much in terms of sacrifice, as if sacrifice were a virtue instead of being a necessary evil due to man's incompetence in not improving his earthly lot. India thinks too much in terms of overcoming desires, instead of realizing that desires are incitements to creative action.

India's splendid spiritual philosophy has become misinterpreted in India and needs re-valuation. It requires restatements in ways wholly consistent with its fundamental meaning, and at the same time consistent with human progress. No great difficulty stands in the way. Philosophy in India should ask why Ultimate Reality has come forth as Objective Reality. The answer is not that interpretation of *lila* which implies Brahma wants to engage in a play or a sport for amusement. The only answer which will inspire a movement leading to human progress is that Ultimate Reality seeks creative action and development as Objective Reality. That is to say, Objective Reality is Ultimate Reality, or Brahma, or Buddha, or God, becoming external and self-conscious and seeking a material evolution. It is subjective Pure Spirit moving into objectivity in a quest for free, creative action.

As long as India refuses to accept some such interpretation of life as this, so long will India remain the prey of her own overemphasis on Ultimate Reality as the only reality. There are some signs that Indians are beginning to see the light. One indication is the Presidential Address, delivered by Professor A. R. Wadia, of Mysore University, at the Sixth Session of the Indian Philosophical Congress, held at Dacca in December 1930. That address is far more important as a creative impetus for New India than all the manifestoes of the politicians. It ought to be circulated over India by the million. Too, in Mysore, there is Dr. R. Shamasastri, grown old in wisdom and understanding, a great scholar, who has not allowed cloistered scholarship to blur his vision of the realities of life. I like his analysis of the Manu injunction that a householder is justified in possessing enough reserve of wealth for three years—which Dr. Shamasastri works out to mean at the present time 200,000 rupees for a householder with ten members to his family ("Economical Philosophy of the Ancient Indians," published in the *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Vol. XII).

In Calcutta, are intellectual leaders who are exploring new ways of interpreting Indian thought so that it will not hamper modern progress. They include such men as Dr. S. N. Dasgupta, now at work on an interpretation of life which emphasises creative action in the human sphere; Professor Nalinakha Dutt, Professor B. M. Barua, Professor Mahendranath Sircar, Dr. Kalidas Nag, Dr. Narendranath Law and Sir C. V. Raman. These and others I have met and discussed

with them India's outlook on life. Whether the currents that are being started in new directions will gather sufficient power to influence India at large is for the future to know.

Professor Raman told me that he recently received a letter from a Hindu asking why in his lectures he talked so much about physics and so little about metaphysics. Professor Raman said he replied: "My dear Sir, India and China have devoted themselves to metaphysics for hundreds of years and you can read the result in any morning's newspaper."

India must understand what that means or India will be lost. There is no salvation in this life through metaphysics alone, as far as a nation's existence is concerned. Raman points the way to the missing factor if earthly salvation is to be attained.

India once knew a full life, in accordance with the possibilities of development in the pre-Christian era. Tagore pointed it out to me, as we discussed together last winter at his home outside Calcutta, India's present plight. He said that *when Buddhism was in flower, about the time of Asoka, India developed a wide spiritual culture, a high art and large material progress as well. India must return to that same co-ordination, but expressed in modern terms.*

How can it be done? I find the simplest and at the same time the most profound rule for the attainment in an article "Three Rules for Daily Practice" which appeared in THE ARYAN PATH for April, 1932: "Purity in Causation. Accuracy in Space. Punctuality in Time. Apply them to your own office work, if you please, and convince yourself that the higher life is highly practical."

Those are the directions for a true understanding of human progress. India must learn them, not by repeating the words, but by action. God help India if she does not learn them. There is no hope for her otherwise in this modern world where mankind is charged with expanding creative spirit, objectively, by means of purity in causation, accuracy in space and punctuality in time. There is enough mysticism in interpreting the right understanding of that phrase, in terms of human progress, to keep any mystic busy for a lifetime.

J. W. T. MASON

II

[**T. Chitnavis** wrote in the first volume of this journal on "Three Kinds of Reading" and "Care of the Body". He is a born educationist, who has travelled in many parts of the world, a silent but careful observer of how the young are taught and how the adults teach themselves.

Mr. Mason's contentions and Mr. Chitnavis's plea bring to mind an old article written by "A Brahmin," a friend of W. Q. Judge, in *The Path* for December 1893 under the heading "India between Two Fires". He wrote:—

"On the one hand, the introduction of Western civilization is ever increasing our wants; on the other, we are, for many reasons, becoming poorer and poorer; many find themselves unable to make the two ends meet, others are in pinching want. While foreign luxuries are becoming common, our means of livelihood are becoming scarce, and we find ourselves *between two fires* as regards our economic condition.

You in the far West may not sympathize with our thoughts and aspirations, with our movements and actions, yet purified, regenerated India, rising Phœnix-like from the ashes of its dark Kali Yuga, would be able to yet instruct the West by expounding its time-honoured Shastric teachings, and in that relation, if not in others, it is bound to the West by the holy tie of spiritual sisterhood, a tie that can not, should not, be ignored by you."

Is there no escape from the two fires? Is there no possibility of using them instead of dreading them?—EDS.]

It is going to be difficult to write "a note" on this MS. It is full of thoughts not probed to the core by their father-creator.

I must begin by thanking Mr. Mason for his sincere interest in the future of India. Not having met him and talked about modern India with him, he will kindly overlook any misvaluation of his views. I heartily agree with his final conclusion; but whether he will accept my understanding of it is another matter.

Two very different propositions appear to him as one:

First he says: "The West is affecting the desires of the East because in the West there are higher standards of living for the people and more material comforts."

Then: "In other words, the influence of the West emphasises the necessity for developing a philosophy of objective reality."

These two are *not* the same thing.

"In other words" are not redundant words; their use reveals a fundamental misunderstanding.

The fact recognized in the first statement constitutes a danger, the most grave danger which India is facing.

The second statement contains a remedy, the only remedy, which will save India to herself and for the world.

India's betterment will not come from the first; it is bound up in the second.

"Material comforts" and "higher standard of living" as ordinarily understood are bringing the downfall of the west. The motor-car morality, the cinema precepts and Hollywood examples, the contraceptive-ethics which not only connive at but encourage fœticide, are not the only progeny of "higher standards of living" and "material comforts". Virgin widows of modern India are bad, but "virgin" mothers of the west are worse. The former are a curse for which none can blame and all must pity them; but the latter? Of their own volition, inspired by their lessons in science and helped by their co-educational schools, they desire to indulge so that "experience" and "self-expres-

sion" may result. Examples from other spheres of life can be multiplied. We say, show us a single institution in this second quarter of your twentieth century which has not suffered corruption. Even the best, your literature, is it not coloured by sex and selfishness both glorified without a sense of shame or of proportion?

Accepting for a moment Mr. Mason's premise that desire for betterment precedes political freedom, we might ask—what kind of betterment should India desire? Western civilization has helped people licentiously to indulge in material comforts and now that civilization is threatened. The moral and ethical aspects of buying and selling, of banks and capital, have been disregarded and now, as we would say "Karma is overtaking them all". Political and economic considerations are neither primary, nor so important as ethical considerations. We who love India and are aware of her wretched poverty and sad plight, do not see her redemption in that political freedom which would *follow* the desire for the standard of living which the west is finding out to be high in the wrong direction.

Mr. Mason thinks that Indian ideals of desire-control and self-sacrifice constitute our weakness. We, on the other hand, thank India's Gods who have impressed her with the virtue of sacrifice, for sacrifice *is* a virtue and is *not* "a necessary evil due to man's incompetence". We offer praise to India's Rishis who have taught her not only the supreme value of overcoming desires, but also the right method of sense-conquest. "Desires are incitement to creative action," says our author. What kind of creative actions? Imagine a New York of chaste girls, of self-sacrificing bankers, of honest businessmen, of sincere advertisers (chaste, sacrificing, honest and sincere as we understand these words in our ethical philosophy). Would such New York not exist to-day if sacrifices had been made and if desires had been controlled yesterday? Would such a New York be so down and out as it is to-day? And what is said of New York is true, *mutatis mutandis*, of every city in the Occident from Los Angeles to Leningrad, and alas! is fast becoming true of westernized cities in the Orient.

But on p. 587 our author expresses the truth about the real cause of India's present-day degradation: "India's splendid spiritual philosophy has become misinterpreted in India and needs re-valuation." India's plight is not due to her not adopting the western standard of living and developing western craving for material comforts; nor will such adoption and such longing bring her anything else than the conditions now flourishing in the West.

We must not blame India's hoary philosophy but its misunderstanding and misinterpretation. Indian philosophy of the *Gita*, the summation of our philosophical thought, is just the philosophy which India needs. That

philosophy is objective without being materialistic. It teaches men and women not only to construct bridges of wood and iron, but also to build that other bridge which enables them to cross the stormy waters of Samsāra. The nation which only knows the former art perishes; the nation which knows the second also learns how to build a succession of crumbling bridges of wood and iron, and—lives on. Mr. Mason quotes the poet Tagore about Asoka. Well, Asoka believed in the maya of the world, and that is one reason why he built an Empire that endured, nay endures, for his is a living and vital example, his are practical and beneficent rules of life. India's downfall came when the flower of Buddhism was enjoyed, plucked, and without a thought for the morrow was thrown away; the tiny seeds of life in that flower were not preserved and sown in India; scattered they were carried away by the winds of Karma and fell in soils prepared and unprepared and of other kinds. The same is fundamentally true, though in another way, of Krishna who preceded and Shankara who followed the Buddha. Combine and unify the philosophies of Buddha and of Shankara and you have the philosophy of Krishna. That philosophy teaches that Ultimate Reality is neither subjective nor objective but both; it does not consider the other world more real than this, nor this objective earth superior to the subjective worlds. That philosophy is not for India alone, but for the human family in both hemispheres.

Mr. Mason errs when he thinks that the problem of India and that of the West are different. "It is true that the West will have to adopt other ways of life and will have to take into its own culture the knowledge of Ultimate Reality which India has contributed to spiritual philosophy. *But that is the West's own problem.*" (Italics mine.) But is it? We say, it is one problem. Believers in Karma, we see the Motion of Law which brought India and Britain together for the education and benefit of both. The very political chaos will settle into a pattern when the builders of many kinds of bridges, be they Indian or British, learn how to build the Bridge of Life which enables people to cross the waters of ignorance and illusion. Let the West abandon the fancy that what it has evolved is a prize and a triumph. Let it dispassionately recognize the sour and even bitter nature of the fruits now ripening on its tree of civilization. When European nations, when the peoples of the two continents of America, recognize that their philosophy of life, labour and government implies the pursuit of personalistic happiness which cannot but compete and war against other persons and governments, then they will see that there is but one problem, the world-problem. Its solution will come through the Universal Philoso-

sophy which teaches that Reality is neither of earth, nor of heaven, but of that Compassion and Repose which are omnipresent; that Compassion sustains itself by ceaseless sacrifice, and that Repose by ceaseless control of the movement of desires and senses.

Fortunately the signs and omens are not all bad.

With the passing of every year there are more lovers and adorers of Krishna in the world. In every European tongue *The Bhagavad-Gita* is now available. In India (nay, in the whole world) no teacher possesses the influence over the minds of his students or over the hearts of his devotees as does this Divine Man—not even Muhammed in India or Jesus in Christendom. These two and Confucius and Buddha have more numerous worshippers perhaps, but none of them seems to wield the power and exert the influence of Krishna. The reason for this, it seems to me, is that none of them awakens that perception of the facts of Life which compels intellectual honesty and mental sincerity. The words and deeds of Krishna are potent sifters of man's thoughts and feelings. They expose us to ourselves, and more, they convince us that none can gain peace or power save by one's own endeavour to raise the self by the Self. This exposure, so humiliating to the mortal's pride, brings a vision of our inherent immortality, and thus unveils the truth that the woes of the world cannot be removed by some magical vicarious atonement. Christendom or Islamdom may count a greater number of martyrs, the reason being that Christians look up to a crucified and ascendent Christ, while Islam up to a Prophet of prophets now active in the heaven world of Allah, each interceding on behalf of the faithful. *This engenders an other-worldliness, which is so peculiarly subtle as to escape attention.*

The other-worldliness which energizes the orthodox Buddhist is of a different nature and is rooted in a different soil. Recognizing that illusion (maya) of the world and ignorance (avidya) of man as due to the delusion (moha) of craving for sense-life (tanha) the Buddhist has emphasised the subjective aspect of Nirvana. While rightly disregarding the illusory nature of human personality and rightly teaching that it is ephemeral, transient and not worth troubling about, the Buddhist has not emphasised the existence of the permanent individuality which experiences Nirvana and attains Buddhahood. The Mahayana tradition, however, approximates the philosophy of Krishna.

The teaching which is pre-eminent in the *Gita* is—to do one's duty by every duty, and thus bring this world to duty. The injunction of Krishna is that each man must follow his example; he is in the world: "There is nothing, O son of Pritha, in the three regions of the universe which it is necessary for me to perform, nor anything possible to obtain which I have not obtained; and yet I am constantly in action. If I were not indefatigable in action, all men would presently follow my example, O son of Pritha. If I did not perform actions these creatures would perish ..." (III. 22-24). Nay more—to enable men to do this efficiently and worthily he insists, ever and anon, that in the heart of each, saint and sinner alike, Divinity is enshrined.

It is the *Gita* which destroys the view that subjective and objective realities are distinct, that heaven and earth are two localities; how?—by distinguishing between the personality which survives not, and, the Individuality which can be made to survive on earth as it subsists in immortality in heaven. When men and women, irrespective of geographical and other distinctions, learn to live as Immortal Individualities, and kill in themselves the selfishness of personal desires they will no more find themselves in the predicament of Africa; that land of numerous gold-mines finds it very difficult to procure enough of gold for its own use! That is the state of India: full of gold mines of Spiritual Truth, but.....!

T. CHITNAVIS

Materialism and indifference to all save the selfish realization of wealth and power, and the over-feeding of national and personal vanity, have gradually led nations and men to the almost entire oblivion of spiritual ideals, of the love of nature to the correct appreciation of things. Like a hideous leprosy our western civilization has eaten its way through all the quarters of the globe and hardened the human heart. "Soul-saving" is its deceitful, lying pretext; greed for additional revenue through opium, rum, and the inoculation of European vices—the real aim. In the far East it has infected with the spirit of imitation the higher classes of the "pagans"—save China, whose national conservatism deserves our respect; and in Europe it has engrafted *fashion*—save the mark—even on the dirty, starving proletariat itself! For the last thirty years, as if some deceitful semblance of a reversion to the ancestral type—awarded to men by the Darwinian theory in its moral added to its physical characteristics—were contemplated by an evil spirit tempting mankind, almost every race and nation under the Sun in Asia has gone mad in its passion for *aping* Europe. This, added to the frantic endeavour to destroy Nature in every direction, and also every vestige of older civilizations—far superior to our own in arts, godliness, and the appreciation of the grandiose and harmonious—must result in such national calamities. Therefore, do we find hitherto artistic and picturesque Japan, succumbing wholly to the temptation of justifying the "ape theory" by *simianizing* its populations in order to bring the country on a level with canting, greedy and artificial Europe!

For certainly Europe is all this. It is canting and deceitful from its diplomats down to its custodians of religion, from its political down to its social laws, selfish, greedy and brutal beyond expression in its grabbing characteristics.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Lucifer*, May 1891, p. 179

WHAT IS FAITH?

[**J. S. Collis** is the author of *Modern Prophets*, *Forward to Nature*, and *Bernard Shaw*. Our regular readers will remember his striking article "What is Philosophy?" in our issue of January 1931. This essay on "Faith" also is full of Theosophical ideas, though we wish it had discussed the relation of faith to will. H. P. Blavatsky has described faith as "a quality endowed with a most potent creative power"; without this power faith is "like a wind-mill without wind—barren of results". The *Gita* states that faith is of three kinds and enumerates their signs and marks.—EDS.]

"Science has in a hundred years transformed the face of things, left Religion in ruin, knocked Philosophy off its pedestal, and converted the world we live in into a seething cauldron." We may take that statement from Mr. W. G. Bond as a remark typical of the general western outlook after a century of concentrated science.

That it is a false statement is beginning to be understood by the new generation. Those who belong to that generation are ready to grant that Science has done many things; but one thing they see it has not done, and can never possess the facilities for doing—namely harm Religion or so much as singe the hem of Her garment.

There is no conflict between Science and Religion. How often we hear that phrase! And with what little understanding is it generally uttered! We hear it from the lips of scientists who piously flirt with religion or from priests who impiously flirt with science. A vague, comfortable phrase pronounced by the vague for the the vague—seldom fiercely with the sense of its abounding truth.

Yet it is just this truth which when grasped relieves us of a tremendous intellectual strain and actually makes a great deal of our reading unnecessary. We are then free to advance forward in peace, rendering with perfect good humour unto Science and Religion those things which severally belong to each.

The reason why it has been thought that Science has undermined Religion is because the latter is hardly ever used in its right sense—and this because few possess it. Religion is a question of faith. And faith is not at all what it is generally supposed to be. It has nothing to do with the-will-to-believe. Faith is *fido* I trust; not *credo* I believe. Faith has no traffic with credulities and creeds. Faith is parasitic upon no beliefs whatsoever and fears no dogma. It rests upon a *foundation of trust* which rises in the mind of the individual on contemplating the universe. It does not arise in every person who contemplates the universe. Those in whom it does, possess Religion: those in whom it does not, are without Religion. Actually there are few in whom it does arise. *There are few faithful men; Religion is rare—a fact overlooked as a rule on account of the immense number of those who profess it without justification.*

The feeling of trust may come, of course, by means other than that of objectively looking at the world. It is, however, one starting point of Faith, and in this essay I shall consider it alone. Take a concrete instance, then, of an experience producing an expression of faith. I observe, shall we say, "the moving waters at their priest-like task of pure ablution round earth's human shores." To put it more severely, I observe the course and final destination of the London sewerage system. I see it flowing into the sea. I expect it to make the sea foul, slimy, smelly, poisonous. Yet it does not do so. It enters the water, is translated, and soon becomes indistinguishable from the vapour which, rising into the air, eventually descends in the form of rain to fertilise the soil.

Now this fact, this Law strikes against my mind with such force, it seems so tremendous, so significant, so final, so promising that I draw conclusions: I say—*The universe must be all right; everything must be ultimately well if this daily miracle is performed.* That is an expression of faith; it is an argument of common sense following the contemplation of Law. It presupposes the *a priori* gift of being able to marvel at the spectacle. Those without that power can never have faith.

This feeling of trust arising from the contemplation of Law is continually supported by the presence of Beauty. For the man of faith, indeed, Beauty even more than Law is the foundation-stone of all hope, philosophy, and religion. In it he sees the signal, the promise of absolute righteousness at the root of life.

The existence of these two things, Beauty and Law, is sufficient for those who really perceive them. It was enough for Walt Whitman:—"A mouse is miracle enough to stagger sextillions of infidels." "If the sun and moon should doubt they'd immediately go out" sang William Blake. The snap of this phrase answered the snap of his mind as, beholding the universe, he saw how *obvious* it was that if everything was not all right nothing could be right. "Have faith" wrote Edward Carpenter. "If the universe were alien to your soul nothing could mend your state, there were nothing left but to fold your hands and be damned everlastingly. But since it is not so—why what can you wish for more? *—all things are given into your hands.*"

We must face the fact that these men, simply on the strength of their affirmations, were prepared to delegate the whole problem of evil to a sub-committee. They dismissed it. There were many things they did not understand and in the tragedy of which they shared, but that which they did see at one glance was enough to take away their doubts—the cloth of Beauty and the Law. That was enough to go on with. It was too much. "If nothing

lay more developed the quahaug in its callous shell were enough." For them, as for all who really look at things, Purpose, most beautifully obscure, yet pervades the visible charactery of the earth. For them indeed "the moth and the fish eggs are in their place". For them the difficulty is not in being certain of cosmic government—"the wonder is always and always how there can be a mean man or an infidel".

Now we are asked to believe that Science has left Faith in ruin. Yet it could only accomplish this by taking away from men the faculty of Wonder—the handmaid of insight. Only if it could blind men's eyes and blur their emotions could it really undermine Religion. And perhaps we may grant that this is what Science actually has done. A century of concentrated science, producing so much machinery, has indeed had the effect of turning the eye from the main object and confusing the mind as the main issue.

Tennyson provides a painful illustration of this. He was the poet who is famous for "keeping in touch with the scientific thought of his time". He studied the findings of Science with great care, in strong contrast to the preceding laureate who protested that the Scientist would rather "peep and botanise upon his mother's grave". It is instructive to compare the utterances of these two men concerning the stars. Wordsworth, looking at the stars and not at the scientific books, addressed an ode to Duty—that is, to the Divine Principle:—

> Stern lawgiver! yet thou dost wear
> The Godhead's most benignant grace;
> Nor know we anything so fair
> As is the smile upon thy face:
> Flowers laugh before thee on their beds;
> And fragrance in thy footing treads;
> Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong;
> And the most ancient heavens, through
> thee, are fresh and strong.

Tennyson, looking at the scientific books and not at the stars, wrote the famous line so often quoted by the mechanists:—"'The stars' she whispered 'blindly run.'" It did not occur to him that if they blindly ran there could be no Law up there at all—an idea which one glance at the incredible discipline of the sun and moon alone shows to be manifest nonsense. But he was so distressed by what Science had said concerning "atoms running about purposelessly in space" that he became confused and felt that the universe was a purposeless flux—a non-sequitur from which he should have been saved by common sense and common sight—(the two most important senses).

The scientists had not meant to injure any one's faith. They had simply gone on with their work making new discoveries concerning the structure of the world, which brings us to our central point. Under the domination of a strange Climate of Thought, this era, from which we are just emerging, has been the victim of a gross non-sequitur. Namely—*that description and information amount to explanation: that when something has been described it has been explained.*

It has somehow come to be believed that scientists having given us more information concerning the universe, having supplied new descriptions of its evolving, have *therefore* explained its actual existence. This non-sequitur has twined itself like the serpent Error round the minds of a generation of men. Yet Science never explains.

Newton did not explain why a stone falls to the ground. It falls to the ground owing to the agency of Gravitation, he informed us. That is interesting; but not very interesting, for we do not reach a fundamental and are forced to enquire what gravitation is. It is really Speed, we learn from Einstein the latest describer. That also is interesting; but not very interesting, for we still have only learnt *how* the stone falls: we remain in the dark as to *why* these various agencies exist at all. Why does the stone fall? We still ask, and we are still answered—Because it falls. Darwin gave us superbly suggestive descriptions as to how life has evolved, but he did not attempt to answer why it should actually do so. Nitrogen and oxygen may combine to make air, something behind nitrogen and oxygen may combine with something else to make them, and so on back and back, but still we have only received descriptions of how a process works without being any further enlightened as to why it is there at all. The most brilliant botanist can do no more than describe a flower's Becoming: its Being remains the Mystery. Information, however passionately pursued, however cherished by those who have fought for it through sweat and pain and hardship, however delicately built up, never becomes Knowledge, never becomes Truth, but remains information to the end of time.

Science has explained nothing. Of course this is really obvious to every one, since if the riddle of life had been solved we should have heard about it! What troubles men is the thought (equally foolish but more easily imagined) that Science has explained *away*. God has been explained away, and with Him Meaning, Purpose, Order. As soon as that thought began to rot the modern mentality the psychological group of scientists appeared, who seemed to be explaining away our deepest feelings. It was thought that "the complexes and ductless glands serve to explain the feelings," that "psychology explains away the awe of emotional experience" and so on. It was believed that the experience of ecstasy and of love were disposed of by an examination of their mechanism—a strange non-sequitur.

Those who do not see, those who do not love, those who do not feel—and it is true to say that there are many who lack these gifts in this Machine Age—easily fall victims to the scientist who says: "It has been proved that joy is purely a question of a good digestion, love purely sex, and in fact everything high and spiritual derived from physiology and

matter."

We do not know whether those things have been proved. Actually they are contrary to experience. But even if they were proved the man of faith would not be at all dismayed—*for no one has the least idea what Matter is.*

The position of this man of faith who is armed with absolutely nothing save Love, is very strong. It is interesting to note how those who are not thus armed imagine that he is in as much danger as themselves. Mr. J. W. N. Sullivan in his *Galileo or The Tyranny of Science* speaks of how the poets were depressed by the Iron Laws of the universe, and goes on to write satirically against the scientists—"Men who must have been theory-mad, soberly maintained that little particles of matter wandering purposelessly in space and time produced our minds, our hopes and fears, the scent of the rose, the colours of the sunset, the songs of the birds, and our knowledge of the little particles themselves." Yet in spite of his satire Mr. Sullivan fails to understand the position of the man of faith.

No poet, (and if I call upon poets more than others to support me in this essay it is because, as Mr. Hugh I'A. Fausset has so truly said, the poets were the first priests and shall be the last!), no true poet is in the least distressed by the Iron Laws of the universe; on the contrary, as pointed out above, he is immensely encouraged by them. As for his attitude towards the atoms, electrons, and neutrons who are also supposed to distress him, he is quite content to say—"Well done little atoms! If you have really accomplished all this, I am deeply impressed with your creativeness, and unconditionally put my trust in the ultimate righteousness of your cause."

We may note that those who are without faith soon reveal their ignorance of what constitutes faith by emphasising the two things which are supposed to undermine it—namely the Iron Laws of the universe and the flux in which the little particles of matter wander about. The man of faith, it seems, is exposed to two opposite dangers —too much Law and too little Law! Truly there is no co-operation amongst these enemies of Faith—the mechanists receive poor support from the fluxites. For when men have become blind and are without love and can no longer read the signature of Beauty, then, in their fear and in their fury, they too hastily seize any stick to beat the dog with—but it breaks in their hands, for they can never get hold of the right end of it, as there are two ends, and both are wrong.

It cannot be two strongly emphasised that the man of faith is in no danger from Science. Whatever the scientist may say, however confused may be his utterances and the utterances of those who are confused by him, the man who sees and trusts, need do no more than distribute praise as to the merit of each new description. However frantic the flames of doubt around him, he walks as one unsinged amid the fiery furnace.

And it cannot be too strongly emphasised that those whose "religion" rests upon any other foundation than this little flame of trust, are in a perilous position. If they place their trust in any dogma, or in any theory concerning the arrival of man, the structure of the world, or the geographical situation of God, then indeed they are at the mercy of Science, and between them and it there shall and should be everlasting conflict.

Neither yesterday nor to-day has Science had any real power to undermine Religion. There was plenty of cause for Doubt before the nineteenth century! Men were confronted with the same problems of evil and pain and disease at all times. There has always been cause for Doubt; and always if it has been dispelled the same agency has dispelled—the power to see, and seeing, accept.

Science cannot take faith away until it causes the loss of eyesight and insight. It can only confuse weak men as to what they really think by non-sequitous pronouncements, long words, and anæmic prose. The quality of faith is hard in that it can never be given to any man as other things are given; but it is blessed in that from him who truly wins it, it cannot be taken away.

Let us finish by getting clear regarding one thing conveniently forgotten by clever men. The opposite to Faith is not what is generally supposed. The man without that faculty is, he supposes, a superior person who disdains superstition, tests all things before believing them, and lives with olympian calm under the banner of scepticism. I wish I could think so. But it is not so. The opposite to Faith is lack of insight and imagination, it is blindness, deafness and fear—taking away the vitality which goes with Purpose and Meaning.

J. S. COLLIS

IS POVERTY THE BADGE OF SAINTS ?

[In her recently published novel *New Heaven, New Earth,* **Miss Phoebe Fenwick Gaye** wrote that "the action of bestowing makes the meanest beggar temporarily a king". She develops the theme in this article.—EDS.]

"It is more blessed to give" we are told, "than to receive,"—and, if interpreted truly, it is also far more pleasant. For to be able to give implies an abundance in the giver; whereas to receive sometimes—not always—implies a lack, a sense of poverty in the receiver which, if indulged in, may destroy the morale of a nation, or perhaps of a world.

After all, one of Man's first impulses in the baby stage is to give—and first intentions are often best! Nobody who has once witnessed the grave enjoyment of a baby in presenting something—a leaf, a cake-crumb, anything—to its mother, can doubt that *that* action gives it as much pleasure as it ever afterwards receives from the nicest birthday gift. But the world is singularly blind in appreciating this fact. The blessedness of giving—to ordinary tired humanity—may possibly be perceived later in some vague far-off world: it can certainly have no bearing on present-day conditions. It is charity to give to the poor, of course, but by now the very word charity itself is suspect, as our quotations show—"cold as Charity," "Charity child," and so forth.

In any case who are the poor, and what is poverty? Poverty has always been considered an essential part of the holy life, the world knows, in every country and under every banner of faith. Just as in the main the great teachers of the past have praised the same virtues in man, and denounced the same sins. But especially in this question of poverty the brown and tattered cloak of Saint Francis may be said to have fallen on them all. Long, long ago poverty became the perquisite of religion, and bare feet and begging-bowls the sign manual of would-be saints as well as beggars.

And yet—poverty *as* poverty, is there any necessity for making a virtue of the thing? To follow in the footsteps of the Buddhas, Mahomet, Jesus Christ, was it really necessary for their followers to sell all they had, *unless they could give to the poor as well?* Obeying one half of the injunction is useless without obeying the other, and too often barefoot saints have found it sufficient to *take* from the poor without giving anything in return. It was as if they said "I am poor: I have nothing: therefore I am good."

But wherein lies the virtue of being poor? In the mere fact of owning no personal property? Then every workhouse pauper is more virtuous than the ratepayer who supports him—and no one in his senses believes *that.* No, the world has been labouring under a

great delusion in this matter of poverty—for surely if we examine the lives of those who first inspired the doctrine, we never find ourselves thinking of *them* as poor. How can we? It cannot be possible for one minute that they thought of *themselves* as lacking anything. Their renunciation of material possessions—pomp, power, riches—was no theatrical adoption of the tattered-cloak policy, but a very necessary shedding of *un*necessaries. They had outgrown the need for these things, as a snake outgrows its skin,—and they shed them as inevitably and easily.

So it is with History's greatest men and women: they are born givers, not receivers. Conscious of no lack or loss themselves, they overflow with beneficences to others—though outwardly they may be "poorer" than their disciples. We may be certain that the thought "I am poor: I have nothing" enters their heads as little as it enters the head of the baby presenting the leaf to its mother. Rather, they have so *much* of what is essential that poverty is about the last word one can apply to them! They know that they have something to give to the world and proceed to give it, without fear of the consequences or thought of the future. Whether they express the gift in music or poetry, prophecy or good deeds, the result is the same: we think of them as benefactors. Schubert overflowed with melody as naturally as a waterfall: he may have had to sing for his supper in grim earnest at the time, but who thinks of him as poor? Oliver Goldsmith was in perpetual money difficulties, yet he found time in the debtors' prison to write *The Vicar of Wakefield,* and toured the continent, paying his way by playing his fiddle at tavern doors. Was such a man poor, considering the pleasure he gave, the experiences vouchsafed him? . . To turn to the Acts of the Apostles, was Peter poor when in response to the plea of the crippled beggar he replied "Silver and Gold have I none, but in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk!" Who can deny the affluence that was able to bestow the priceless gift of health? The "little poor man" of Assisi himself, whose example threw a whole country into a fervent misapplication of poverty, was *giving* all the time. Those hands of his we know so well in Giotto's pictures were not outstretched to receive anything, but to *give*—whether to birds or beasts or fellow-men mattered not to him so long as he gave, and the same is true in degree of all great figures. That, it seems to me, is the lesson Humanity has still to learn: that the true Charity is a *natural* outpouring of benefactions, an expression of the best in Man which should be as inevitable as the scent of flowers or the song of birds. The world is sick to-day with a surfeit of "the things which are Caesar's": it is still hungering and thirsting after a sufficiency of "the things which are God's,"—and that is not "Charity" in the usual sense of the word. In the

famous thirteenth chapter of *Corinthians* the word is used to signify an intense spiritual love—the love which inspired the outstretched hands of all the saints of all the earth—to *give* and not to receive,—and yet in giving to receive eternally. (For it is a commonplace by now that the hand outstretched to give is at the same time open to receive.) If such as these were poor, then blessed are the poor indeed, for they own the whole kingdom of Heaven!

PHOEBE FENWICK GAYE

Act individually and not collectively; follow the Northern Buddhist precepts: "Never put food into the mouth of the hungry by the hand of another"; "Never let the shadow of thy neighbour (*a third person*) come between thyself and the object of thy bounty"; "Never give to the Sun time to dry a tear before thou hast wiped it." Again "Never give money to the needy, or food to the priest, who begs at thy door, *through thy servants*, lest thy money should diminish gratitude, and thy food turn to gall."

But how can this be applied practically?

The Theosophical ideas of charity mean *personal* exertion for others; *personal* mercy and kindness; *personal* interest in the welfare of those who suffer; *personal* sympathy, forethought and assistance in their troubles or needs. We Theosophists do not believe in giving money (N. B., if we had it) through other people's hands or organizations. We believe in giving to the money a thousandfold greater power and effectiveness by our personal contact and sympathy with those who need it. We believe in relieving the starvation of the soul; as much if not more than the emptiness of the stomach; for gratitude does more good to the man who feels it, than to him for whom it is felt. Where's the gratitude which your "millions of pounds" should have called forth, or the good feelings provoked by them? Is it shown in the hatred of the East-End poor for the rich? in the growth of the party of anarchy and disorder? or by those thousands of unfortunate working girls, victims to the "sweating" system, driven daily to eke out a living by going on the streets? Do your helpless old men and women thank you for the workhouses; or your poor for the poisonously unhealthy dwellings in which they are allowed to breed new generations of diseased, scrofulous and rickety children, only to put money into the pockets of the insatiable Shylocks who own houses? Therefore it is that every sovereign of all those "millions," contributed by good and would-be charitable people, falls like a burning curse instead of a blessing on the poor whom it should relieve. We call this *generating national Karma*, and terrible will be its results on the day of reckoning.

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Key to Theosophy*, pp. 205–6

FIVE LIGHTS AT THE CROSS ROADS

IV.—HILLEL

[**Geoffrey West** continues his fascinating study of some learned Souls in the early centuries of the Christian Era. He has already written about "Ptolemy Soter," "Apollonius of Tyana" and "Simon Magus". The last of the series on "Simon ben Yohai" will appear in our November issue.—EDS.]

Apollonius can scarcely be said to have founded a school; that of Simon Magus, as such, had a comparatively brief existence, and though Gnosticism, like Neo-Platonism, gave light to the Christianity which overwhelmed it, the triumphant Church so generally denied its secret knowledge that it must be deemed an obstacle to, rather than a channel for, the larger truth. With the burning of the Alexandrian library by a mob of ignorant fanatics, the doom of wisdom was struck in Egypt; enlightenment shrank back into the East whence it had come, leaving for the most part only a legend and a memory save, it would seem, among the Jews. For a thousand years the Jewish oral tradition, the Kabbalistic knowledge presently set down in elusive manuscripts largely incomprehensible to the uninitiated proved the most effectual channel of knowledge for the ignorant West. The *Zohar*, in particular, of directly Jewish origin and authorship, has been for the Occident, it is said, what the *Book of Dzyan* was for the Orient.

To seek the origins of this wisdom among the Jews would need a plunge far backward into eras of which Western history has but little record. Israel was never, it is said, granted those higher keys which were the treasure of Egypt (Jewish tradition not unnaturally dissents from this, declaring Abraham to have been the instructor of Egypt), but their considerable knowledge had received augmentation and new impulse in the last few centuries B. C., first from Babylon and then, even more decisively, from Alexandria. Something of this has already been seen in the case of the heretical Simon Magus, but the influence upon orthodox Judaism was to prove more lastingly important. It is interesting to take such (at first glance) a purely national figure as Hillel, and to discover beneath the dark cloak of the typical rabbi the shining soul of the initiate. No miracles are ascribed to him, and the suggestion that, like Moses, he lived a life of 120 years neatly divided into three periods of forty years each, is admittedly allegorical rather than factual. The date of his birth is impossible, that of his death difficult, to fix with precision. Certainly he must have died before Jesus came to manhood and mastership; as clearly his sayings were still upon the lips of Jesus and his enemies alike.

He was born in Babylon of a Jewish family, and it was only when he had learnt all of the Law known there, that, a married man probably with children, he undertook the long and laborious journey to Palestine, as a provincial coming at last to the metropolis of knowledge. There he attended the lectures of Abtalion and Shemaiah, the most noted scriptural expositors of the day, as often as possible—for his meagre payment as a hewer of wood was not always able to yield him the fee imposed by the doorkeeper of the school. One winter Sabbath eve, being penniless, in desperate resort he climbed to the roof to listen at the window, and there was found in the morning; half-dead and overcome by the cold, for it was snowing, he had fallen asleep. Evidently his merit was already recognised, for despite the occasion he was hurriedly lifted down and revived, the teachers declaring that for one so worthy the Sabbath might be desecrated.

The times were far from happy for the struggling student. The Pharisees, to whom Hillel had attached himself, were in constant acute dissension with the Saducees, the temporary favourites of Herod. Their point of difference, the refusal of the Saducees to accept the authority the Pharisees allowed the oral tradition, is significant, but in fact the Saducees were much more politically than religiously minded; they sought rather power than truth or holiness. On their behalf Herod persecuted their opponents at times remorselessly, and at last, perhaps on the deaths of his teachers, Hillel abandoned the unequal contest and returned to Babylon. A few years passed, and then work came to him from those who had been his friends and fellow-pupils in Jerusalem. The new heads of the school—Saducees—were said to have "forgotten," or to be ignorant of, the teaching of "the pair". Hillel knew the maxim: "Learn where there are teachers; teach where there are learners," and conquering his natural modesty he accepted his duty. Arriving again in Jerusalem, he so utterly routed the Saducee elders on a disputed point by an overwhelming appeal to precedent and authority that they instantly gave up their headship of the school to him. Herod too, it appears, had grown weary of unceasing squabbles, and welcomed him as "a man of peace". For many years he held the most honourable national position in Israel as president of the Sanhedrin, and though Shammai, whose great learning in the Law was reckoned equal to his own, came presently to share his place in the school, and was for a while to seem even to triumph over his finer wisdom, in the end Hillel's teachings prevailed, and his descendants, bearing the honoured name of Gamaliel, became for centuries his hereditary successors as heads of the supreme Jewish council. He established in particular a tradition of peace. Through many periods of conflict his followers held aloof, guardians of a wisdom destined to endure beyond the rise and fall of empires.

In Christendom at least the name Pharisee bears an unfortunate connotation of self-righteousness certainly not due to the disciples of Hillel, and won rather by the temporary predominance in the days of Jesus of the influence of Shammai, in every respect a less attractive figure, proud and passionate in nature and holding to the Law in all the rigour of its application. He insisted, for example, surely with unnecessary virtue, that nuptial songs must speak only literal truth of the bride, where the much more human Hillel allowed that the singer might seek to see her with the bridegroom's beglamoured eyes. If the saying that "whosoever has acquired the words of the Law has acquired the life of the world to come" is correctly reported, it would seem to belong rather to Shammai than to Hillel, whose aim was always to stress the spirit rather than the letter. He held it evil to neglect due study of the Law, or, on the other hand, to study it for material gain, but his deepest virtue, the true fruit of study, was to love one's fellow men. Asked on one occasion for a summary of the Jewish religion in its relation to conduct, he replied: "What is hateful to thee, do not unto thy fellow man: this is the whole Law: the rest is mere commentary." In hard times of warfare and high taxation, he sought a milder interpretation of the Law for "the amelioration of the world". As a judge he was merciful as well as just. Praising Aaron for his love of peace and of his fellow men, and for his illuminating exposition of the Law, he defined his own most evident qualities. And he not only taught the Law, but lived in accordance with his teachings. He was ascetic (the more flesh, he said, the more worms), benevolent, sympathetic, free-handed, pious, humble, humane, lovable. So great was his good nature that on one occasion, it is recorded, he played the part of footman for an impoverished nobleman, and the spirit of charity and warning against self-righteousness breathes through all his sayings.

> Judge not thy neighbour till thou art in his place.
>
> Trust not thyself till the day of thy death.
>
> He who wishes to make a name for himself loses his name; he who does not increase his knowledge decreases it; he who does not learn is worthy of death; he who works for the sake of a crown is lost.
>
> My humility is my exaltation; my exaltation is my humility.

Never could he be provoked to anger.

One prodigy only has been connected with his life. On that occasion many sages were assembled at Jericho, when a heavenly voice sounded out of the sky, saying: "Among those here present is one man upon whom the Holy Spirit would rest if his time were worthy of it." The eyes of

all were turned instantly to Hillel. In his own day he was revered for the purity and depth of his scriptural exegesis; in him, it has been said, "came to flower the sweetest and strongest gifts that faith in Israel's God had power to stimulate".

In all these things he appears as a very typical if unusually gracious figure in the long and honourable line of the Jewish patriarchs. May we say no more? It is a strangely familiar image he uses in declaring the spiritual nature of man, likening the soul to a guest upon earth always to receive first consideration, and for whom the habitation of the flesh should be kept pure.

As in a theatre and circus the statues of the king must be kept clean by him to whom they have been entrusted, so the bathing of the body is a duty of man, who was created in the image of the almighty King of the world.

Not merely the relation of microcosm to macrocosm, but the unity of all existing things, appears in the epigrammatic: "If I am here—so says God—every one is here; if I am not here, nobody is here"; while a universal truth familiar to all theosophists is implicit in another saying also attributed to God:

To the place in which I delight my feet bring me. If thou comest to mine house, I come to thine; if thou comest not to mine, I come not to thine.

In those passages in the *Talmud* which claim for Hillel a knowledge of all languages, not only of men but of trees and herbs, hills and valleys, animals and even demons, most modern writers can discern only "grotesque exaggeration," yet what is this ability more than that of Apollonius to read the thoughts of all men without having learnt their tongues? Honour, it is stated, was accorded in Israel only to those who could prove themselves the direct and intimate pupils of some distinguished forerunner. Does not this in itself assume the importance of that oral tradition, that teaching not to be written, despised by the Saducees? Hillel spoke but little at large; his knowledge was publicly seen as a passive wisdom. Yet his disciples in the end prevailed against all others, and he was the teacher of Johanan ben Zakkai from whom Joshua ben Hananiah learned the esoteric doctrines he taught the famous Akiba, who in turn gave his knowledge to Simeon ben Yohai, father of the Kabbalistic writings.

GEOFFREY WEST

TOWARDS WORLD-BROTHERHOOD

Below we print two articles which aim at one objective—attempts at realizing the ideal of a world at peace and engaged in constructive work to the glory of man.

The first deals with the culture of the generation of to-morrow, the second with that of the adult peoples of the world of to-day. The former visions the teacher as priest, the latter would like the politician to turn prophet.—EDS.

I.—EDUCATION AND IDEALS

[**George Godwin**, novelist and biographer has contributed two volumes in "To-day and To-morrow series". Last February he wrote in THE ARYAN PATH on "The Rebirth of Western Civilization".

In the following article he pleads for imparting the "knowledge that lights the soul".—EDS.]

Education might seem at first glance a matter for the educationalist alone, but since the preparation of the rising generation becomes more and more obviously a major factor in the ultimate solution of world problems, education is to-day the concern of everybody. Past are the days when children may be handed over to the pedagogue and left to him to make or mar. In the past this process too often resulted in the latter eventuality. And herein we can see a fruitful cause of much of the chaos which harasses the world to-day.

The advent of a general interest in education has resulted in a healthy criticism of orthodox methods. The teacher is no longer left severely alone to handle the human material entrusted to him with something of the immunity of a monopolist whose craft is a sealed book to the lay mind. This is all to the good, for out of a widespread discontent with the results of school and university training have emerged new ideas and, with them, ideals.

The post-war conditions of the world have forced us to look a little deeper into many problems that scarcely vexed our forefathers at all. We have set out to discover fundamental causes of world disorder and of that spiritual malaise that afflicts our age. And so we have come to first principles.

Among some of the finest minds of our time are to be found men and women who see in the educationalist the potential saviour of the world. And for a very obvious reason: it is he who moulds the pliant minds of those who will shoulder later the burden bequeathed to them by the folly and ignorance of ourselves and those who went before us.

The modern world is in a state of social, economic, and spiritual transition. Values, a few years ago accepted as fixed and permanent, are vanishing with a rapidity quite disconcerting. The sacred character of property, once regard-

ed as sacrosanct, has been challenged and the philosophy behind that veneration for possessions examined and by many found wanting.

Patriotism, still, alas, taught as a sort of pseudo-religion involving the diabolic principle in the form of the foreign State, nevertheless seems to the modern mind a dubious virtue until it can be given a wider expression. Everywhere, the old ideas are crumbling and the new slowly emerging into roughly articulated form. For the average individual, pre-occupied with the personal problem of survival in a world economic crisis, all this is bewildering and perhaps a little frightening. His once-firm faith has been shaken and in many instances shattered. His old values have been demonstrated as false. He feels about for the new.

And this is where the central problem of education impinges on everyday life as a concern touching every living human creature upon this planet.

When we look about the modern world certain aspects of it strike the mind with the force of the completely incongruous. There is an abundance of all things necessary for physical life, food, raw materials, fabrics, transport. Yet many starve and more live with the fear of starvation ever present in their minds. We see a world equipped with scientific apparatus and power beyond the wildest dreams of our great-grandfathers, yet we find alongside this conquest of the external world about us a sheer inability to harness knowledge to the service of wisdom. We have used science as a weapon of war more often than as a weapon of healing, or as the instrument whereby social injustices could be abolished.

Who, then, is to set straight this weary world? I think the true answer is: the educationalist. And for this reason: he moulds the minds that will determine the character of the world of to-morrow, and as he moulds them so will that world be.

When the full realization of that truth breaks in on one's mind there comes with it an overwhelming sense of the awful responsibility that all parents and teachers must shoulder to-day, since evade it they cannot. Considered thus, the profession of the teacher assumes a priestly character. And one day, we may hope, it will be so regarded.

But what of it to-day? Communities reveal their scales of values by the manner in which they reward those who perform functions. *A society that showers rewards and honours upon victorious generals, while it systematically underpays and neglects the teacher, obviously places a higher value upon the art of killing than upon that art which teaches how to live.*

No other profession is so badly paid, so discouraged, so tacitly looked down upon. Yet, to his eternal honour be it said, the teacher more often than not attempts no balance between services and reward, but gives of his best freely and with enthusiasm.

There can be no doubt that it will soon be found necessary to revolutionize the status of the teaching profession. This will come about when we recognize the supremely important nature of the work he has to perform.

What is that work?

In the modern world education may mean many things. It may mean that smattering of the three "Rs" given in elementary schools—a smattering which has produced a just-literate class. This aspect of modern education is of questionable value. It has done much to destroy the old crafts, in their place it has merely given a capacity to occupy leisure by those avenues of escape provided by the cheap magazine, cinema and newspaper. Such education is merely a convenience and no more, and its value is a doubtful one by the criteria of usefulness and capacity to uplift.

Technical education has increased with the swift forward march of science and the technicalizing of industry. Here, again, however, the purpose is narrow, and the end clearly defined.

There remains such cultural education as is provided at a limited number of universities which remain more or less the close preserve of the socially elect or wealthy.

One defect is common to all these branches of modern education: it is their sterility on the side of constructive thought informed by ethical concepts. In other words, by that idealism whose growth and dissemination is the only hope of the world to-day. It may be objected that the teaching in the humanities in the older universities does include, if indirectly, the idealistic. But does it?

Beginning with elementary education we find minds commonly coloured by a species of nationalism that postulates tacitly the wickedness and potential enmity of all other nationals and thus makes for that war-breeding nationalism that has ruined the world at a moment in history when every conceivable material weapon lay to man's hands for a reconstruction of a Golden Age. The technician is rarely taught anything beyond the curriculum of his work, Chemistry, Medicine, Law and the like. The older universities foster class feeling, which, after all, is but the expression of a narrower patriotism.

Yet in every case the application of broad ideas to education is possible. For example, the small boy receiving a free State education will only benefit from, say, the teaching of history if the facts are interpreted to him and given moral significance.

Like most men of my generation, my recollections of a Public School education, so called, are of the daily mastering of unrelated and isolated historical facts. One was taught the great battles of the world, even the approximate numbers slain. One was taught, too, the orthodox commandment: Thou shalt not kill.

But so dormant were the minds

of both masters and boys that we were quite able to keep these two things in watertight compartments in our minds. The single killing of a man was murder. We knew that, determined never to commit that heinous crime. But when we went from chapel to parade ground and set about preparing for the art of wholesale murder, just what we were about never occurred to us.

Obviously, then, *what is needed to-day is a system of education that shall interpret life to the rising generation.* Elementary education is not enough unless the future worker is taught to see his place in a scheme which is a *world* scheme. The technician is a barbarian still so long as he turns his knowledge and skill to bad ends.

On a recent occasion while chatting to an acquaintance, a man who has specialized in aerodynamics and the problems of flight, I remarked that his work must be of absorbing interest to him. His reply was disconcerting. He said: "Do you know to what uses I am putting my knowledge? I will tell you. I am working ten hours a day perfecting a means of releasing poison gas from aeroplanes rather more lethally than we can do it at present." And when I asked him why he did not give up such work he agreed that he would like nothing better, but pleaded economic necessity and the demands of a family.

The point is, however great the economic pressure, my friend would not have stooped to the murder of a single individual, but was yet prepared, solely because of his early education, to spend long days in organising some holocaust for to-morrow.

The facts are indisputable. Our system of education ignores moral ideas and those new ideals of world peace and world brotherhood that are the only hope of salvation in the modern world. The children of our schools are not going to inherit a world where values are more or less permanent and peace universal as did the people of happier generations. They are virtually being prepared in a fashion to handle the greatest problems that have ever faced humanity.

As I have said, these problems are not those that faced our forefathers who had yet to discover machines and thus increase the production of material necessities and devise ways of swift transport for them. There is not a material problem in the world to-day that cannot be solved because of difficulties inherent in it.

The world remains chaotic because the mental and moral approach of humanity is defective. The kernel of world problems is in the human heart, the human head.

Thus the supreme importance of the teaching of a world view is paramount. The inculcation of formal creeds, each one in conflict with some other, gets us nowhere. The rising generation needs to have the problem which will face it in later life clearly defined and stated. It needs, too, to be stimulated into the frame of mind that will desire to work towards peace and justice, the honourable and fair distribution of wealth, and the ultimate federation of the world.

Education, then, as I see it, is far more a matter of ethics than of scholarship. *Knowledge we need, but it must be that knowledge that lights the soul.* In a world still torn by ancient hates there is need for ideals. Are we going to place before the young a grand conception of life, or are we going to commit the crime of perpetuating old hates, fears and indifference to all that makes life desirable?

That is a great question. Upon how we answer it depends the fate of the world.

GEORGE GODWIN

PATRIOTISM OR NATIONALISM

[**Vernon Bartlett,** London representative of the League of Nations Secretariat since 1922, is also the speaker on "Foreign Affairs" to the British Broadcasting Corporation in London, and has been so since 1927. His weekly wireless talks are on "Internationalism" and he has spoken many times on India in that connection.

After seeing active service during the Great War, he attended the Paris Peace Conference as Reuter's agent. He was on the staff of the *London Times*; special correspondent in Switzerland, Germany and Poland, 1919–20; correspondent in Rome, 1921–22.

Among his many publications the following have attracted much attention: *Behind the Scenes at the Peace Conference, The Brighter Side of European Chaos, No Man's Land*; (with R. C. Sheriff) *Journey's End,* as a novel.

The devil of nationalism remains to be exorcised in the west; meantime he has hurled his curse at the whole of the east, including India. The need for popularising such analyses and ideas as are contained in this article is great indeed.—EDS.]

In these difficult years when people are too busy arguing about the causes of present distress to plan a cure for them we are given a terrifying list of material obstacles to recovery. If it were not for tariff barriers, or for the too rapid nationalisation of industry, or for the loss to Europe for political reasons of the Indian, Chinese and Russian markets, or for the scarcity of gold to back our currency, or for the rivalry between France and Germany, or for the existence of communist propaganda—if it were not for one or more of these factors, we are told, the world would have become, in Mr. Lloyd George's wartime phrase, "a place fit for heroes to live in". But all these are symptoms of a disease rather than its causes, and the disease is nationalism, which Professor Carlton Hayes defines as "a modern emotional fusion and

exaggeration of two very old phenomena—nationality and patriotism".*

To realise why and to what extent nationalism is an evil we must, then, first decide what is a nation. And of all the many definitions perhaps none is better than the one given by a schoolboy to Mr. Basil Mathews and recorded by him in his *Clash of World Forces*. "A nation," declared this boy, "is a people who agree to live together and to obey the same laws". Why these people should agree may depend upon many different factors. To a certain extent geography naturally plays a part, since people even of different language will tend to become one nation if they are isolated by the mountains or by the sea. Race, again, plays its part, although not to so great a degree as is generally believed, for purity of race is almost unknown in Europe where the sentiment of nationality is most dangerously keen. Even language alone is not decisive for there are many linguistic minorities which have become fused into a larger majority without any hint of compulsion. There is, for example, no real independence movement in Wales or in Brittany, and every unfortunate individual who wishes to enter the Swiss Government's service must know French, German and Italian, the three official languages of his country. Lastly, both politics and religion may help to build up a nation, and in the case of the Hebrews it is almost impossible to distinguish between nationality and religion, so that the desire to marry a person of another race is seldom strong enough to overcome this double obstacle of prejudice. And in considering all these factors the one point which is both clear and important is that, as the schoolboy said, nationality is the result of an agreement to live together far more than any instinctive feeling, as is patriotism. The consequence of this is that mankind has been less loyal to the idea of nationality than to the ideas of religion, democracy, and so on. Great minds have so frequently risen above it. "The whole world being only one city," wrote Oliver Goldsmith, "I do not much care in which of its streets I happen to reside."

But patriotism in its true sense is something very different. It is both bigger and smaller, for it covers a very limited geographical area, and yet it represents a very great spiritual force. In its implication of a love for our fatherland it surely only refers to that portion of a country which has become a part of our inmost feelings by reason of childhood memories. The *patria* of the Roman meant much the same as the *pays* of the French peasant to-day, for while the sophisticated have for their own ends confused the word with "nation," the peasant who talks of his *pays* has in mind his village, the fields he tills, the river he fishes, the

* *Essays on Nationalism.*

inn where he drinks his wine. All those things are a part of himself, and in a confused way he knows that he would sacrifice his life to protect them just as surely as his wife would risk herself to save her child. His love of his *pays* is unselfish and ungrudging, and it is one of the tragedies and perils of our civilisation that we have exploited an almost religious incentive for materialistic reasons.

Plato, it will be remembered, felt that the ideal state should not contain more than 5040 free citizens, partly because that particular form of loyalty which I understand to be patriotism could not comprise a great population. But since the days of Plato, and especially since steam and electricity began to make the world so small, our material interests have so developed that our patriotic feelings have become distorted and confused. The labourer in his slum cannot feel so strong a patriotic sentiment as the peasant in his *pays*, and it is not by mere chance that communism is an urban product.

But if there is nothing envious or mean about patriotism there may be about nationalism. It was nationalism which prompted Stephen Decatur's famous phrase "My country right or wrong," and confusion between nationalism and patriotism is at the root of nearly all our troubles of to-day. Even the author of an exceedingly able article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* is not free from confused thought in this respect, since he defines patriotism as an instinctive willingness, as old as civilisation itself on the part of every individual "to defend, even with his life, the interests of the nation into which he chances to be born, regardless of whether the national cause in which he struggles be in any given case good or bad, right or wrong". But the idea of nationalism is neither instinctive nor old. It has now become a force to which all other loyalties, including even religion, are supposed to be subordinated. "Thou shalt not kill," has been changed to "Thou shalt kill to extend the territory owing allegiance to thy national symbol". Its growth has been helped by many causes, one being the disappearance of Latin as the current language between all the intellectuals of Europe, and another being the French confusion after their Revolution of the ideas of democracy and nationalism. Like the Russians of our generation, they tried to convert people to their ideals and to their language by use of the bludgeon, forgetting that a religion reacts differently upon an inquisitor and upon the individual whom he so earnestly desires to convert. What should have been an era of freedom became, in the words of Professor Carlton Hayes, one of "linguistic oppression and persecution for the benefit of a sovereign national state".

The nationalism which led to the war of 1914 to 1918 was mild compared with the nationalism that we have known since that

war, and which even to-day drives the world to spend nine hundred times more on armaments than upon efforts to maintain a reasoned peace through the League of Nations and its Permanent Court of International Justice at the Hague. Our patriotic instinct and our nationalistic culture have become so confused that our indignation when a foreigner ventures to criticise even our climate is now spontaneous. And yet nationalism, which has been developed in order to encourage material prosperity, must bring material ruin unless it can be modified, for industry that has developed under national protection now demands those wider markets from which national frontiers exclude it. We have built up means of production on a world scale and have then done everything we can to prevent the free flow of these products by barriers of customs duties, sentiments and national prejudices, which divide the world up again into a series of unhappy little units.

None of the causes of our present distress, to which reference was made in the opening paragraph of this article, would be serious were it not for this exaggerated feeling of nationalism, and every delegate to any international conference knows that he dare not agree to any compromise which might arouse the nationalistic wrath of the popular press of his own country. At a time when the human race has greater material benefits at its disposal than ever before, it is threatened with the collapse of civilisation due to materialistic impulses which are entirely out of date. Machinery is not a Frankenstein monster which will destroy man, but an instrument which may teach him that unless nations can develop their ideas of loyalty in order to keep up with the development of their machines they must all perish.

The situation, however, is not so hopeless as it seems because of this all-important fact that nationalism, unlike patriotism, is not instinctive. If the idea of nationalism was superimposed upon the instinctive love of one's native soil there is no reason why the idea of internationalism should not be developed in the same way. A Roman felt loyalty, in the first place, to his City on the seven hills and, in the second place—and much less strongly—to the Roman Empire. The Greeks, with all their immense power and influence, looked upon Athens, Sparta or Corinth, rather than upon Greece as a whole, as their fatherland, and experienced an imperial patriotism covering the far-flung dominions which was cultivated and not instinctive. In neither case was there a distinct intermediate period of *national* patriotism which could be in any way compared with our nationalism of to-day. And if we once admit that nationalism is a sentiment that has been developed mainly to encourage our material prosperity, we should also be able to admit that internationalism may be developed in the same way now that material reasons so obviously demand that it should be.

It has, of course, to be recognised that there can be no return to the old instinctive patriotism; like our other instincts it has had to be checked, modified or utilised in the interests of what we call civilisation. But there need be no limit, great or small, to the territory to which we feel loyalty owing to the power of this instinct. Holland and Spain, for example, have at times ruled over much vaster territories than fly their flags to-day, and yet the Dutchman and the Spaniard have not felt a diminishing loyalty proportionate to diminishing territory. In the same way the loyalty which we are encouraged to feel towards all people whose country is printed in the same colour on the map as our own may be extended indefinitely, since even in a small island such as Great Britain the Yorkshireman may find more spiritual kinship with the Fleming than with the man of Devon.

The issue which faces us seems clear. Unless we can escape from the confusion between patriotism and nationalism, one of the finest sentiments of which the human being is capable will be so perverted that it will plunge the world again into war, and destroy all the best that we have inherited from past civilisations. If we cannot return to primitive patriotism we have to choose between "the modern emotional fusion and exaggeration" of nationality and patriotism which must lead to ever-increasing international rivalry, and a yet more modern emotional fusion of patriotism and internationalism which would enable us to realise that our right to love our own country, county, town or village is no greater than the right of everybody else, white, yellow, brown or black, to love his own country, county, town or village with the same freedom and to the same degree. It is not merely a matter of chance that a man who is about to sacrifice his life for his country generally visualises not an immense multitude of people who owe allegiance to the same flag, but the few streets or lanes, houses or fields, that he knows best.

VERNON BARTLETT

THE WORSHIP OF BEAUTY

[**Prof. D. S. Sarma** is the author of *The Gita and Spiritual Life*, *A Primer of Hinduism* and other books. He wrote in THE ARYAN PATH for August 1931 on "The Path of the Lover in Poetry and Religion".—EDS.]

The worship of beauty is not like the pursuit of truth or the striving after righteousness. While these have never produced untoward results, men have often found beauty a snare and a delusion. Puritans all over the world look askance at those who urge the independent claims of beauty; and the lives of the artists in general and of the hierophants of beauty in particular seem to confirm their suspicions. No wonder then that the wise teachers of mankind have refrained from laying as much stress on beauty as on righteousness and knowledge. Nevertheless every cultured man must know exactly what beauty means, what forms it has, how far and under what conditions it is necessary for a harmonious self-development. There is beauty even in ugliness in which we are doomed to spend our lives, and its claims are insistent. To neglect them or oppose them would be as unwise as to overrate them or make them exclusive. In the one case we deprive ourselves of a great part of our happiness and probably of our knowledge of Reality, and in the other we lose all sense of proportion and degrade ourselves into mere voluptuaries.

What is beauty? Libraries of books give the answer and some of them are among the dullest books that have ever been written. Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus, Baumgarten, Kant, Hegel, Schelling, Schopenhauer, Bosanquet, Bridges and Croce—to mention only a few names—have attempted to solve the problem in the West. And in our own country all the exponents of the Rasa theory following in the footsteps of Bharata, have done the same. Lollata with his *Utpatti-Vada*, Sankuka with his *Anumana-Vada*, Bhattanayaka with his *Bhoga-Vada* and, above all, Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta and their numerous followers with *Abhivyakti-Vada* have tried to probe the secret of aesthetic experience. But beauty remains a mystery. Systems of aesthetic philosophy designed to catch beauty are like the clumsy attempts of elderly Gopis to catch the immortal Child Krishna, who laughs and sports and eludes them all. To some thinkers beauty is the perfect symmetry of parts; to some it is a function of life; to some it is a form of knowledge, to some it is an experience of pleasure; and to some it is a revelation of the Spirit. Thus we have the mechanical, the biological, the intellectual, the emotional and the mystic conceptions of beauty. The main differences between them arise from the different points of view from which beauty is judged.

Some have taken an entirely objective view of beauty, while others have taken an entirely subjective view. Some have emphasised the formal element in beauty, while others have emphasised the expressive element. Some have identified themselves with the observer of beauty, while others have identified themselves with its creator. Some have confined themselves to the causes while others have confined themselves to the results of beauty. There is an element of truth in all these theories. The error lies in their exclusiveness. Beauty *is* the expression of Rasa, that is, of universal and impersonal emotion, as the Hindu aesthetic philosophers discovered long ago, and as Croce and his followers are explaining to-day. It expresses itself in harmonious or symmetrical form. It promotes the highest ends of life; and thus it brings us nearer to the knowledge of the ultimate Reality. Beauty is not entirely a thing of matter and form, for these are only its media. It is not entirely a thing of love and desire, for these are as much the result as the cause of beauty. Nor is it entirely a thing of the spirit for this is only its unmanifest or abstract state.

Beauty is one of the ultimate values of Life having its mysterious analogue in the bliss of Spirit on the one hand and symmetry of Matter on the other. Properly understood it is one of the pathways to Reality. The beautiful is one of the aspects of the Real. The aesthetic experience is one of the phases of spiritual experience. Rasāsvāda is one of the forms of Brahmāsvāda.

This statement is quite different from the statement contained in the well-known but rather misleading lines of Keats:—

> Beauty is Truth, Truth Beauty; that is all
> Ye know on earth; and all ye need to know.

If by truth the poet means Reality, we know that beauty is only one of the aspects and therefore the statement is only partially true. If, on the other hand, by truth the poet means what is scientifically or logically true, then the statement is much less correct, for beauty is not necessarily truth, nor truth necessarily beauty, inasmuch as we have dreams that are beautiful and facts that are ugly. *Righteousness, beauty and truth are the three ways in which we apprehend Reality according as we use our moral, aesthetic or intellectual faculties.* Hence the cultivation of beauty is as important for us as the pursuit of truth or expression of righteousness. Art is as necessary for the development of the spirit as science or ethics.

But in one sense the statement of the poet seems to be profoundly true. Beauty is the unconscious perfection which all creatures attain when they are most true to the law of their own being. But in that case truth is not only beauty, but also righteousness. In fact, Svadharma, in the broadest sense of the term, connotes the three highest values of truth, righteousness and beauty. It connotes truth because the crea-

ture is true to itself. It connotes righteousness because the creature acts in accordance to the divine will, which is the law of its being. And it connotes beauty because the creature then becomes the embodiment of an impersonal and universal joy. Thus every act of Svadharma is a miniature perfection making the creature god-like for the moment. That is why the lilies of the field, as Jesus observed, never swerving from the law of their own being and taking no thought for the morrow are clothed in glory surpassing that of Solomon. All natural objects and creatures which instinctively follow the Law have an inimitable grace and perfection of their own. They are ensouled by the eternal bliss of Deity. But their circle of perfection is closed. They are truly *standing* examples of divine beauty. Man, on the other hand, who is free to swerve from the Law has not a circle of perfection but a spiral.

Let us now examine some of the practical considerations of the worship of beauty.

Firstly, it is the duty of every man in practical life to make himself sensitive to beauty and to cultivate the sense not only in himself but also in others around him. To a soul sensitive to beauty nothing gives greater pain than to be forced to endure the slovenliness of dress, coarseness of language and crudeness of manners—not to speak of the sight of a thousand and one unlovely objects. The only safeguard against such things is to establish standards of comeliness in the public mind and to enforce habits of conformity. Meanwhile the worshipper of beauty should make himself a perfect example to others in matters in conduct, demeanour and dress.

Secondly, we must see that the beauty we strive after is not of the superficial kind. It is no good to be particular in small things and indifferent in big things. We should not be pennywise and poundfoolish in the pursuit of beauty. When beauty is superficial, it amounts to mere prettiness; when it goes deep into the heart of things and lies hidden by large masses which obstruct the view we have a difficult type of beauty called sublimity. And we have so many grades between prettiness which is small, easy and superficial and sublimity which is great, difficult and profound. The worshipper of beauty should be sensitive to all of them and should always be prepared to sacrifice, if necessary, the lower to the higher. He should train his eye to look through both the microscope and the telescope to catch the fugitive gleams of beauty in the universe. In judging a work of art he should never be carried away by mere appearance, but he should see whether there is as much internal as external beauty, and further he has to probe and see how deep it penetrates. Is it skin-deep, or flesh-deep or bone-deep? For instance, in judging a poem he has to ask himself whether the poet ever gets beyond mere beauty of words, and if he does whether

he touches the mere outworks of the soul or reaches the inner citadel, whether he is concerned with the appetites and pleasures of the flesh or with the imagination and the sanctities of the heart.

Thirdly, the worshipper of beauty should cultivate a wide catholicity of taste and learn to appreciate all forms of beauty. One of the benefits of studying a foreign literature is that the student acquires a catholicity of taste and learns to appreciate beauty in forms and modes of life —entirely different from those to which he is accustomed. It is no small thing from the point of view of culture or of humanity for a Hindu to learn to appreciate some of the beautiful ways of life of the English society which is so different from his own. Again, apart from the perfection of form it is the strange and unfamiliar beauty of the classics that explains their fascination for the modern mind. Similarly it is strangeness added to beauty that explains the lure of romance. Therefore the worshipper of beauty should ever be on the alert to recognise and welcome new forms of beauty in life, literature and art.

Fourthly, the worshipper of beauty should be entirely freed from the desire of possession. The difference between the higher goods and the lower goods of life is that the latter suffer diminution when we share them with others, but the former, far from suffering diminution, acquire an enhanced value. Beauty is one of the higher values of life in which there are no exclusive property rights. In fact, many aesthetic philosophers maintain that disinterestedness is an inalienable condition of appreciation of beauty. Beauty should be admired or cultivated for its own sake for the pure joy that it brings to the mind—joy in the widest commonalty spread. Beauty should be regarded as an extra, above all utility, comfort or convenience. We have already seen that it is only when a feeling ceases to be personal and becomes detached that it becomes fit for artistic treatment and thus generative of beauty. The *bhāva* has to be impersonalized and universalized and converted into a *rasa* before it becomes beautiful. Art is supposed to possess the power of liberating us from all passions and calming our minds. That is what Aristotle calls catharsis. Art possesses this power because of the infinite or cosmic character of beauty. When the true artist waves his wand, the spirit of beauty sleeping in our souls is awakened, our *upadhis* are removed for a moment and we have a taste of the bliss of the Infinite. We then understand the meaning of the famous utterance of the Hindu aesthetic philosopher that *Rasāsvada* is akin to *Brahmāsvada.*

Fifthly, the worship of beauty should not degenerate into a sickly sentimentality or a hidden and exclusive cult. Aestheticism has become a byword on account of this mistake. Beauty, of course, is different from righteousness and truth. But all the three are

inter-connected. The aim of art is, of course, neither to inculcate morality nor propagate truth. But that does not mean that art can be divorced from morality or truth any more than the different faculties of the mind to which they appeal can be divorced from one another. Far from this being the case, the foundations of all great art are moral consciousness and ideal truth. A poet to be a poet need not inculcate virtue; he need not even be a virtuous man himself, but he must have a sense of virtue, he must love and admire nobility, generosity and heroism and must loathe meanness, coarseness and cowardice. Similarly, he need not be a constructive thinker, but he must know the value of thought and be able to transmit from the sphere of reason to the sphere of feeling the progressive thought of his age. If an artist or a worshipper of beauty shuts himself in his own chamber without taking part in the drama of human life, he defeats his own end, for the goddess he worships in seclusion will soon sicken and die. No, beauty is a flower that grows in the open air. It requires for its health the sunshine of truth and the waters of purity. Remove it to the dark chamber of falsehood or expose it to the fumes of vice, and it will perish.

Sixthly and lastly, the worship of beauty, as well as pursuit of science and cultivation of moral goodness, should always be guided by a profound religious sense. Tolstoy points out in his noble essay, *What is art?*, that in every age and in every human society there exists a religious sense of what is good and what is bad, common to that whole society, and it is this religious perception that decides the value of feelings that should be transmitted by art. By religious perception, which is of course different from religious cult, Tolstoy means men's perception of the meaning of life. It represents the highest comprehension of life accessible to the foremost spirits of the age. This should be the guiding star of all the activities of the age, the actuating spirit of the artist and the scientist as well as the moralist. In all healthy societies progressing in the right direction religion, understood in its highest sense, should be the charioteer, and morality, science and art the horses under its whip. It is the charioteer that sees the way, the horses have to go as he directs them. Else there would be no safety for the men in the chariot. If the horses get out of hand and think they know better than the charioteer, Heavens help the men in the chariot—which is exactly the predicament in which the peoples of modern Europe stand. If on the other hand the horses are obedient, but the charioteer old and blind, again we say, Heavens help the men in the chariot—which is exactly the predicament in which we in India stand at the present day.

D. S. SARMA

WHAT DOES DEATH MEAN TO YOU?

III.—SPIRITUAL REALITY

[**Max Plowman** concludes his meditation on Death. Theosophical students will note how he has arrived at the occult instruction about the death of the self which results in Second Birth, that of the Self.—EDS.]

Unless we are prepared to adopt a position of pure fatalism and to regard death as "the blind fury with the abhorred shears" it is imperative that we should come to a clear understanding with ourselves about what we mean by Truth and Reality.

Perhaps the most challenging statement made in my preceding article was that "reality has being in complete independence of fact". The endeavour was made to substantiate this belief by citing Shakespeare's imaginative realisation of the dawn, and by pointing out that although the words

> But look, the morn in russet mantle clad
> Walks o'er the dew of yon high eastern hill

are a figure of speech and constitute ***in fact*** a lie, they express the truth because they awaken in the mind the full sense of the reality. We do not need a scientist to tell us that, when the dawn breaks, no sort of gentleman arrayed in reddish-brown homespun is seen starting upon an impossible walking tour. Every sane person knows that as evidence of the facts Shakespeare's statement is entirely untrue: that this is precisely what does *not* happen. The point is that the words *in themselves* are untrue. It is only when they call forth the active co-operation of the heart and mind of the reader that they become true. It is only as the imaginative consciousness of the reader seizes upon the images which the words evoke and allows them to become reflective of his own experience that they become a perfect unified image of the reality of dawn.

Truth is not what it is vulgarly supposed to be—an accurate record of the facts. It is something vastly more. It is something that involves relationship and is incomplete without co-operation. It is something that is meaningless to us unless we actively contribute to it. It is a conditional state of being, not an absolute condition of stasis.

Now the implications of this conclusion are tremendous. For at one sweep we have demolished what is called objective truth. We have said in effect to the Roman Catholic and other Churches: There is no absolute which exists apart from the mind of the subject that conceives it. If you attempt to confine truth to the realm of fact you must substitute for truth some fixation of your own mind due to a misconception of the nature of truth. Christ on the altar, or God in heaven, is a fixation of the mind, a mind that has forsaken imaginative truth for the false security

of fact; and ultimately this conception must express, not the truth of reality, but the falsity of materialism. The mind that is looking for security in the direction of fact is proceeding in the opposite direction to the only way that leads to truth.

Truth is living reality: it is a condition of being; and because it is this, it cannot be contained in the record of anything that has been or may yet be. Truth is not dependent upon any fact in the universe: if all the facts of the universe were other than we know them to be, truth would be unaffected. Truth is the expression of the living relationship between subject and object. There is simply and absolutely nothing that can be taken and placed in isolation—not God himself—and then described as the truth.

Truth is relative, if by that we mean that it depends upon relationship; but truth is not comparative, it is not a matter of vague approximation. It is the result of fusion, and fusion either occurs or it does not. The truth of Shakespeare's imaginative realisation of the dawn is absolute truth because it upcalls in the mind perfect and complete image of the dawn as it is seen by individual perception. The experience of truth is always absolute and without the shadow of equivocation. So that those, like Pilate, who are scornful and impatient with truth because it cannot be presented to them like a philosophers' stone, are just as blindly in error as those who will have it that truth is a stone, a church, a book, or an historic fact. Truth is relative, but absolute in the mind that conceives it; it is not less itself because it is dependent upon you and me in our subjective relations to it.

Now the truth that is expressed in complete defiance of the facts must obviously be wholly different in kind from the "truth" that is entirely dependent upon facts to support it. The reality that has being in complete independence of fact must be very different from the "reality" of the modern psychologist which is entirely dependent upon the conception of the psyche as a static mirror of environment. And the difference between them may be discerned if we note that whereas the first conception places all its weight upon the function and power of the imaginative consciousness, the second regards this creative element as belonging to the order of phantasy. And there can be no reconciliation between them. Reality that is only to be comprehended by the statement of poetic truth must remain inconceivable to the mind that sees in the images of poetic truth only the disordered sport of fancy. It is upon the truth of imagination or the truth of fact that we must all ultimately take our stand.

And what is this truth of imagination? It is nothing more than the perfect co-ordination of experience. *Consciousness is continually receiving images upon the retina of the mind.* These images are of something which the imaginative consciousness accepts as reality, but which the unimaginative consciousness rejects because it cannot co-ordinate them by means of its rude criterion of fact. These images only become real in the mind that receives them by means of the imagination which grasps and co-ordinates them with previously received images. Thus the imaginative mind lives by a series of recognitions of ever-widening capacity, while the unimaginative mind walks the road of ever-narrowing ratiocinations. The one lives from his own stalk and finds nourishment upon every wind that blows; the other lives by a process of analytic verification that becomes in effect a process of progressive disintegration.

The imaginative consciousness that understands how reality has being in complete independence of fact will understand how reality has being independently of all phenomena; and only as it understands this can it have a true conception of spiritual life. It will know that the images of which it is receptive are not self-generated, because they are propagative in the complete body of experience and are therefore capable of belief. And if it is argued that this is to place truth in the position of subjective dependence, the imaginative consciousness can only reassert its confidence and show the validity of its faith by its works; for there is no proof that what the imaginative consciousness believes to be true is true. You can prove the truth of death, but you cannot prove the truth of life. You can prove the truth of the fifth proposition of Euclid, but you cannot prove the truth of Beethoven's quartet in C sharp minor: the one is demonstrable, the other is only persuasive, and, if you are not persuaded, is meaningless. I cannot demonstrate the truth of

> But look, the morn in russet mantle clad
> Walks o'er the dew of yon high eastern hill.

Shakespeare himself can only appeal to the imaginative consciousness for recognition of this truth, and that he has done this implies a courageous and dramatic act of faith on his part. A corresponding act of faith is essential to the realisation of the truth, and this is only possible through the appeal to individual experience. The truth cannot be known in any other way. Dogma is as powerless to teach the truth as a stone thrown at the head is to instruct the mind.

What we know of this life must instruct us concerning the possibility of any other. And the greatest truth that we can learn from our experience of this life is that since nothing has true existence for us outside the imaginative consciousness, everything which has this existence there possesses the nature of being and is not subject to the laws of existence. All things are transmuted by the imagination and seen in their eternal truth. They are translated from the conditions of time and space to the conditions of eternal being; and it is only thus that we discover the nature of

permanence and know that the smile of love and the tear of woe belong to eternal verity.

The wonder of art lies in its power to make this miracle apparent. And how does the artist achieve this wonder? By the gift of himself. The primary hunger of love stirs the imaginative consciousness to recognition of the essential nature of an object and impels him to seek creative means of translating his recognition of truth into a semblance by means of the images begotten in his consciousness. His very power to accomplish this will be in exact proportion to the clarity of his vision. It is by his passionate belief in a reality hitherto unperceived that he is enabled to create the image of that reality.

Verse, Fame and Beauty are intense indeed,
But Death intenser—Death is Life's high meed.

What does death mean to me?

Death means a change in the mode of living. It means freedom from the limitation of sense perceptions in the exercise of pure imaginative consciousness. It means a continuous life of vision, or none at all. It means release from becoming in the realisation of being. It means the final and complete death of that self which, as it now lives, stands between me and participation in eternal life here and now. It means the intensification of all the life I have ever known, until all is pure consciousness. It means the power to re-live yesterday and the power to ante-date to-morrow in timeless being. It means a destiny of free-will. Above all, it means the simple continuity of whole or imaginative life, and the complete annihilation of partial or personal life.

In vision, how easily to be perceived! In fact, how fearfully obscured! For when death comes to steal heart's treasure, he comes as a thief in the night. Death closes the "five windows that light the cavern'd man". Death puts the shutters up; for the light that was, no longer illumines the house. Death hollows out silence, and the ear that listens for a voice hears the *sssh* of death like a retreating wave. Death empties the world of meaning and makes a mockery of all its affairs. Death takes the heart that has hung in anguish and treads it under his ice-cold feet. He is without pity: he jeers at mercy: he wrings most savagely the heart most full of love. Death blinds with his pain and maddens with his cruelty. He draws his scythe about the body of youth, but will pass age by, leaving weariness to groan. Death casts a pall over the sunrise, and makes the sunset ache. Death splits the earth beneath the running brook of happy love and swallows all its joy in an abyss of tears. Death shakes the petals of life and holds up the barren stalk. He makes us to see so clearly that we recognise in every blade of grass the spear of pain. Eyes that have looked long at death grow fixed and stony. Death never answers.

Blessed be death; for there is that over which he is all powerful, and that over which he has no power. Blessed be death; for when his wind has passed right us, then the self that stands between us and reality is swept away. While we could anchor our souls in any material thing, we were not free: there was anxiety for our possession, and belief that, with care, we could cherish it for delight. There was a strong secret chamber in the centre of our hearts which we held against the whole world: there was a fortress of self-defence that contained a shrine to be held if need be against the love of God himself. Surely, we believed, in this which speaks wholehearted self-devotion, I am absolved. Surely in this, to which I give a love that would lay down its life, I am free to find self-release. Surely in the very sanctuary of love I can find a refuge for myself. The rest can go. All I have, I give freely and out of the fullness of my heart: here alone I claim the privilege of love: here alone I hide in a strong tower against the storm of fate.

But the whirlwind came and carried away our strong tower. It razed it to the ground and left us desolate. And because it was a secret tower, our nearest friends passed by unaware of what had gone. The one who contained the whole meaning and expression of life, died. And we died too—died in an agony of despair—died fighting all the way, from support to support, pleading with fate for pity and with life for a single concession. Till there was nothing to defend: not a recess that pain had not ravaged, not a cranny of possession that death had not ransacked.

And still there is nothing.

And yet there is everything. For out of the whirlwind there came a still small voice, and it said: "For the possession of one thing you would gladly have lost the world. You have lost the treasure of your heart. Behold, I give you another world, and in it your treasure. You held it in fear, and your love was bound. See, I have taken away the fear and freed the love." And then we saw what death had power over, and what he could not touch.

All that is of self death takes away. All that would bind another to its delight, even by the finest cords of love, death snaps. Death rolls up the whole world of our existence and bowls it into vacancy. And we are left stark.

But gradually, and right out of the heart of pain, another world opens, a very still, very silent world, without time and space, but a world of such intense reality that it makes the old world look like a bubble floating in the sunshine, mirroring everything in beauty, but having the impermanence of a bubble and being as fragile to the touch. On that day we know that the new world contains the old, and is to the old as the earth to the bubble. We discover that it is a world of being where all things exist eternally without shadow of doubt,

or need of substance. It is a world where merely to think is to be full of action; where merely to desire is to fulfil the heart; where to remember is to return, and to anticipate is to realise.

And then we see that this world of being sustains and upholds the world of existence, as the air upholds the bubble: it enfolds the world of time as the air enfolds the earth. We cannot drop out of it any more than we can fall out of the air. From its living reality, the world that we know takes all its images. Nothing we can do can change or alter this world of being. It is. It has being in one eternal moment which is the moment of its perpetual realisation.

It is to this world we shall all go after the life of the body. "Go?" No, not go; we shall awake: when we rouse from the sleep of the senses we are in that world already, for it is the world of the reality of all that we now see expressed in the terms of sense. It is the world of spiritual reality.

It can be denied. Yet even those to whom it remains a fond chimera need not be wholly without consolation, for, gazing upon the form of love in death, there is abiding heart's ease in the thought: "As he is, so shall I be."

MAX PLOWMAN

Why fear that death which comes from without ?
For when the 'I' ripens into a self
It has no danger of dissolution.
There is a more subtle inner death which makes me tremble !
This death is falling down from love's frenzy,
Saving one's spark and not giving it away freely to the heaps of chaff,
Cutting one's shroud with one's own hands,
Seeing one's death with one's own eyes !
This death lies in ambush for thee !
Fear it, for that is really *our* death.

—SIR MUHAMMAD IQBAL

YOUR LAW

[**Dr. Paul E. Johnson,** Professor of Philosophy at Hamline University (St. Paul, Minnesota, U. S. A.) wrote on "My Duty" in our last issue. He completes his examination of the subject in the following article which deals with human law.

In Indian philosophy the one word Dharma is used for human duties, for man-made laws, as also for the laws of Nature which are active in every object and entity and give each its property. In the *Bhagavad-Gita* the whole subject is presented in a masterly fashion. Dr. Johnson has shown the relation of man and his responsibility to the kingdom to which he belongs ; we wish he had examined the affinity of the man of will, thought, and feeling with the whole of Nature whose laws are invariable and which laws provide the only correct models to be copied by human legislators.—EDS.]

Between law and duty stands a widening breach. Duty is a personal matter, an individual viewpoint, a private affair; law is a common concern, a social standard, a public affair. Duty is particular, law is universal. An individual may make a rule for himself, but no man single-handed can make a body of laws. For law is over-individual, and even the king or legislator frames laws successfully only as he correctly interprets social demands. Duty is self-imposed, an obligation arising from within; law is legislated upon the individual from without. So the contrast stands between my duty and your law.

This contrast gains clearness as we trace the coming of law in human history. Laws develop in the community by the slow accumulation of precedents, in the gradual growth of commonly accepted folkways and social habits. Primitive people, of course, had no written law, but social regulations were not wanting wherever men mingled together in groups. In the struggle for possession, quarrels had to be settled by precedent and established custom. Consequently hunting and fishing rights developed at one level of civilization; rights of pasturage and ownership of domestic animals at another; distribution of agricultural plots at another. And through them all, by habits and conventions of ownership, have evolved the legal codes of property, inheritance, patent, and copyright. Likewise family interests gave rise to marriage laws, business interests to laws of contract, rights of persons under political status to civil laws. So has grown up this extended body of legal regulations for controlling the complex maze of human relations.

It is obvious, therefore, that every valid code of law, written or unwritten, reflects the social interests of a civilization. Hunting rights indicate hunting occupations, pastoral rights nomadic life, land laws an agricultural existence. The Laws of Manu represent the early civilization of

India; the code of Hammurabi testifies of early Semitic civilization. Our Anglo-American law (observes Roscoe Pound) is the outgrowth of the feudal system, with its emphasis not on the will of the actor as in Roman law but on the idea of relation or social responsibilities.* So law appears as a social product, representing a social order, declaring the social will.

Clothed in these robes of authority, law comes to the individual. " Here is your law—take it—observe it. This is the law—obey." The child may not want to obey. The adult may not like the law. But what can a lonely objector do against the united group? How can a child turn against the race that gave him birth? What does it profit a man single-handed to challenge his whole generation backed by countless generations before? It appears wiser to the average man to join his fellows and accept their law as his own. The lone wolf may have freedom, but he loses protection, comradeship, and the strength of united movement. He had better return to the pack. So the normally adjusted individual finds his place in the group, and takes his oath of allegiance to defend its constitution and uphold its laws. "Law is King of all," says Pindar, " mortals as well as immortals".

And yet there is always the minority—a growing minority it now seems—who refuse to accept the law of their groups as binding. " What has your law to do with me? I did not make it. The bulk of the law was formed before I was born. Even the latest statutes and amendments were framed by legislators remote from my ballot. What legislator has ever consulted me, in so local an affair even as a traffic ordinance? Why should your law be mine? " So law is resisted as externally imposed. It is further resisted as formal and rigid, without insight to individual variation or flexibility for individual application. It is resented for interfering with private rights. And who is law after all to reign over us? When fifth century Athens awakened to critical spirit, it found legal systems man-made and concluded that if man is the measure of all things, every man may be a law unto himself. When twentieth century America awakened to critical spirit, it watched man making his laws and declared, " What man makes, man can break".

While this is logical enough, it is evidently lacking in understanding. Human laws are man-made and acquire such authority as they may possess on human grounds. Supporting laws on divine sanction is unnecessary apologetic of doubtful certainty. Law is a human institution and must win or lose its case, so far as we are concerned, at the bar of human judgment. The case of law rests on the question of human value. What is the

* Roscoe Pound, *The Spirit of the Common Law*, pp. 22-24.

value of any law in particular, or legal systems in general for human life? From this approach, it becomes clear that the aim of a law is to define a human right. The English constitution began with the Bill of Rights, the American constitution with a preamble of man's inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It would invert the order to suppose that constitutions exist to support the government against the citizen; because historically, they have arisen to protect the individual citizen against the government. Likewise in common and statutory law, the aim of modern jurisprudence is to defend the rights of the individual against fraud or aggression.

The doctrine that regards law as enemy to freedom is a vicious fallacy. Without law, personal liberty is less rather than more attainable. Note the difficulty of defenceless pedestrians trying to cross a busy downtown corner without traffic regulations. Contemplate the risk of the individual citizen without police or fire protection, without health or quarantine regulations, without laws of contract, incorporation or legal reserve, without writ of Habeas Corpus, and the infinite network of regulations defining and defending personal liberty. Without these requirements of order, the good intentions of all would run amuck in the confusion and conflict of uncorrelated activities. For the speed at which we move and the density at which we are crowded together would soon crush the individual and pulverize the civilization left without direction to run itself. The fact that we operate as a civilization instead of a human horde is the outcome of law-abiding conduct. In the complexity of human relations, we must co-operate to save the whole or the part, the values of the race or the values of the individual. The freedom of each is the lawful achievement of all. Human law is as sacred as human rights.

This is the claim of law as an institution. As such its human value cannot be gainsaid. But is law an end in itself? Having accepted law as an institution, we may yet involve ourselves in difficulty when we have to deal with particular laws. For not every law seems equally good. Many laws fall short of human need; others conflict directly with my sense of duty. Which is the final court of appeal—law or man? Shall law judge men or shall man judge the law?

For instance, in emergencies, shall law be inviolable? Would you break a speed law to get an injured person to the hospital? Would you steal to save a life? Jean Val Jean stole a loaf of bread to save a starving family. It might be necessary to appropriate an automobile to save a town from flood. Would you kill to save a hundred lives, as in case of a trainwrecker who could only be stopped by a fatal bullet? Or again in cases of clear injustice, what is one's duty? Would you

have broken the Fugitive Slave Law to help a negro escape before the Civil War? Would you refuse to be drafted if you could not conscientiously go to war? What shall be done with laws one does not believe in? If opposed to the Eighteenth Amendment, are you at liberty to break it? When, if ever, is law-breaking justifiable?

We shall probably agree with Jesus that man is not made for law but law for man. Law acquires its authority, by reference to human values, and if it comes into conflict with them should defer to the higher principle. But law-breaking, it must be admitted, is dangerous practice. To break anything is by that much to destroy, and law-breaking is always a destructive act. Every violation of law, no matter how trivial, is a blow at the whole legal constitution so important to human values. It is never a course to be entered upon lightly, therefore. The bulk of law-breaking to-day is careless or ill-considered, and as such warrants uncompromising condemnation. *Only when law-observance is the rule can exceptions justly be made in cases of emergency or conscientious objection. Only the conscientious law-observer has moral right in crucial issue to become conscientious objector.* And then only after a careful weighing of values and disvalues is it reasonable to conclude the values won may over-top the values lost.

It will be necessary to guard against deceiving ourselves at this point. Duty may conflict with law, but weaker impulses come often disguised as duty. Wherever it is easier to break a law than defend it, we may justly have suspicions. It is easy to make exceptions for myself, on the excuse of circumstances peculiar to me. To correct this distortion, Immanuel Kant suggests that we universalize our problem and test the duty by viewing it as a law. "Act as if the maxim of thy action were to become by thy will a universal law."* If my defiance of law were by my act to become universal, leading everyone to do likewise, what would the outcome be? Unless it appears reasonable for every other citizen to act as I am going to act, the violation is hardly warranted by its total possible consequences.

Another test of duty in conflict with law is eagerness to bear a full share of the consequences. To break a law slyly with hope of escaping discovery is neither reasonable nor honourable. Any such escape-motive is *prima facie* evidence that a criminal impulse is posing in counterfeit of valid duty. The truly conscientious objector is one who resists the law by promptly and openly giving himself up to the authorities concerned in its enforcement. The honest law-breaker is one who invites the full penalty of his act; without evasion or delay. When all violations of law attain this character, and all violators of law voluntarily offer themselves up to receive the penalty, our erstwhile

*Abbott's Translation, entitled *Kant's Theory of Ethics*, p. 39.

crime-wave will have given way to legal reform. For there is no more effective protest against unjust and inhuman laws than peaceful yet determined surrender to their penalty. By this and other methods of awakening public opinion, laws may be reformed at points where they stand at variance with human values.

We are sometimes advised that law will be outgrown. If this means that all law will be laid aside, it is dubious prophecy. For law, as we have seen, is not a set of childish prohibitions, but a system of reasonable obligations which it is the mark of maturity to accept. And with the increasing complexity of advancing civilization, orderly regulations assume increasing importance in conserving values individual and social. But in another sense, law is forever outgrowing itself. As Roscoe Pound declares of common law, its spirit is a process of unfaltering growth. As one civilization outgrows its predecessor, so one body succeeds another in the evolution of law. No law or system of laws can be taken as final. Each is a social effort to interpret human needs. Many will rise and fall with changing human situations, and give place, we trust, to better and more adequate laws of the future.

PAUL E. JOHNSON

If it is just that a man of 40 should enjoy or suffer for the actions of the man of 20, so it is equally just that the being of the new birth, who is essentially identical with the previous being—since he is its outcome and creation—should feel the consequences of that begetting self or personality. Your western law which punishes the innocent son of a guilty father by depriving him of his parent, rights and property; your civilized society which brands with infamy the guileless daughter of an immoral, criminal mother; your Christian Church and Scriptures which teach that the "Lord God visits the sins of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation," are not all these far more unjust and cruel than anything done by Karma? Instead of punishing the innocent together with the culprit, Karma *avenges and rewards the former*, which neither of your three western potentates above mentioned ever thought of doing.—MAHATMA K. H.

THE EVOLUTION OF RELIGION

[**J. D. Beresford** examines the origins of Religion and religions. As long as modern knowledge ignores the incessant working of the law of periodicity or cycles it must continue to err and see the beginnings of civilization in barbarism, of philosophy in savagery, and of high ethics in petty taboos. If Mr. Beresford's article leads students and scholars to find out that modern religions, from that of the Vedas to that of the Quoran, do not represent any evolution but a process akin to devolution, the breaking up of the one, grand, universal Wisdom-Religion in numerous creeds, a great step forward will have been taken.—EDS.]

As a young man, recently freed from the restrictions of a narrow creed and anxiously seeking evidence against the beliefs and dogmas of the English Church, I found a comforting measure of satisfaction in tracing the gradual evolution of vicarious sacrifice back to the primitive beliefs of the savage. Frazer's *Golden Bough* appeared to me at that time and for many years after, as irrefutable proof that the religion in which I had been educated was nothing more than a development of primitive superstition originating in childish fears of the unknown, and that it could, for that reason, be regarded as lacking any authority for the thoughtful mind. Dogma had its roots in the apparently senseless taboos of the tribe; the god on the cross represented no more than a refinement of human or animal sacrifice to insure fertility or propitiate the thunder; and sensible people might, therefore, dismiss religion, all religions, as a false conception begotten from the simple terrors and infantile beliefs of early man.

Many intelligent men and women, still accept that interpretation and are content with it, just as the members of various religions accept without any desire for further investigation the teaching of priest, parent or other guide whose opinion they have taken on trust. This relegation of further enquiry into the foundations of belief to some presumably higher authority, is symptomatic of the limitations of the human mind. We choose or accept a label and thereafter fit ourselves to match its inscription. We see that our premises work in certain relations and then, assuming them as universals, spend any thought we have to spare in that connection, in confirming the grounds of our faith. Behind this tendency lies the wish to believe whatever it may be, and behind the wish lies the terrifying complex of psychic and physical development that goes to the making of every human being. And it may perhaps be asserted without dogmatism that the nature of the individual's wish is largely determined by the stage of development to which he has attained.

The possibilities for various and contradictory interpretations inherent in material phenomena provide a curious kind of comple-

ment to these different attitudes of mind. We can always read into our selected data the special meaning that we are seeking. The instance I have chosen of primitive religion as observed in the beliefs and ritual of savage tribes, provides a sufficient instance. The interpretation already given is that of science and based on an *a posteriori* argument. We take the Christian religion and break down the claim for its inspiration by showing that it is not founded on any divine interference with human destiny, but is a natural development of primeval fears coupled with an unintelligent conception of natural processes. The argument so far as it goes is complete and unanswerable. The gradual development of the idea of vicarious sacrifice can be demonstrated in detail, and Sir James Frazer having done it very thoroughly, those who characteristically wish to believe the deduction that follows from these premises rest content in their belief in a mechanical world of cause and effect, which pursues its enigmatical course uninfluenced by any external agency.

There is, however, another interpretation to be put upon the same facts in this connection, a reading that may seem to be in complete contradiction to the first. Starting from the assumption of a physical and intellectual evolution strictly in accordance with biological theory, but disregarding the various means postulated as instrumental in originating and perpetuating variation from the ancestral type, we are naturally perplexed to account for a phenomenon that serves no purpose in protecting or developing the species; this phenomenon being religion in its original and literal sense of a *binding* obligation.

Let us take, for example, the appearance of Totemism with its elaborate system of Taboos which must from the anthropological point of view have come very early in the race history. Why, one must ask, should a tribe of savages living a free life of comparative ease, deliberately invent for themselves these strange acts of unnecessary self-denial, each man deliberately eschewing the flesh, however tempting, of his own particular Totem? Again how can we account for the formulation of a law of exogamy whereby marriage between near relations was avoided, among people who in many cases had no knowledge of any causal relation between the sexual act and childbirth?

Inevitably there have been many attempts to explain this extraordinary emergence of religion among primitive peoples. The appearance has been assigned to dream, to fear and, by the Diffusionists, to a centre of culture in Egypt that spread by degrees about the entire world. But the two former explanations cannot be regarded as logically satisfying. They do not account for the facts and even so the postulation of dreams may be regarded as begging the real question. And

Diffusionism as expounded by Prof. G. Elliot-Smith, does nothing to solve the essential problem, since we are still left with no explanation of the *origin* of religion, which, is no more explicable as an evolutionary factor on biological grounds in Egypt than it is in the Australian Bush.*

Yet curiously enough it is the Diffusionist argument, based on the observation of man's innate conservatism, which seems to me to provide the most powerful evidence for the deductions I propose to draw. In Professor Elliot-Smith's instance, "To obtain recognition of even the most trivial of innovations it is the common experience of almost every pioneer in art, science or invention to have to fight against a solid wall of cultivated prejudice and inherent stupidity." And the lower we descend in the scale of culture, the greater is the opposition to change, while if we press our enquiry still further back along the evolutionary scale we gradually lose all sight of anything that can be regarded as personal initiative.

In the pre-human forms of the animal kingdom we find habit, crystallised as instinct, the dominant guide of existence. In the insect world its strange elaborations are so inalterable that any change in them means death. Even in those animals nearest to our understanding, it is unthinkable that any change in habit could be due to the expression of an inner impulse strong enough to overcome the natural routine ordained by this overwhelming rule of inherited instinct. Might we not therefore very forcibly argue *a priori* that the animal "man," evolved through unrealisable generations from such progenitors, would be characterised by just this inability to alter in any considerable detail his natural habit of living, unless it were under the compulsion of outward circumstances? Yet in fact we see him developing a ritual that imposes upon himself the need for effort and self-denial, setting himself strange, unnatural tasks that promote neither his comfort nor his physical well-being.

Now, although it is not possible to elaborate a case in an article of this length, it seems impossible to relate these queer beliefs of primitive man to a slow growth of intelligence. Totemism, for example, provides no evidence whatever of developing from a study of cause and effect, and exogamy is practised by peoples who are completely ignorant of its real meaning and purpose. Wherefore we are confronted with a body of well-observed facts

* Upon the Theosophical account of the origin, I do not propose to enter here,—the essential matter will be found in Stanza IV of the second volume of *The Secret Doctrine*—, because however satisfying it may be to the initiated, it would convey little to those, the great majority of mankind, whose knowledge is derived almost exclusively from objective observation and reasoning. And in this article I am confining myself as nearly as may be to these instruments, attempting in the first place, to present the case for "religion,"—used here as a general term for the belief in humanity's spiritual being,—from the intellectual and logical point of view.

in the evolution of man, which is susceptible neither of a biological nor, from a materialistic standpoint, philosophical explanation. Both, it is true, have been attempted but the solutions offered, as has already been indicated, are not sufficiently inclusive to satisfy the scientific mind. All of them bear the marks, stamped too plainly to be overlooked, of the argument *ad hoc*, the resolute attempt to prove a preconceived deduction.

And I should evidently lay myself open to precisely the same charge if I now proceeded to argue the idealist case in this connection. This is one of the many instances, constantly presented to the pilgrim who seeks truth with an open mind, in which the puzzle is instantly resolved for him if he will make the assumption that man is a spiritual being, a belief insusceptible of proof from purely material evidence and outside the purview of science. Wherefore I do not propose to debate the question under consideration, but to admit frankly that my natural disposition of mind inclines me to find a sufficient account of the problem I have been discussing in a spiritual evolution that is yet in its earlier stages.

For I discover within myself the same promptings, however differently expressed, that compel primitive man to torture his flesh. In him it takes the form either of an apparently reasonless self-denial as in the examples of Taboo already cited, or in actual and exceedingly painful facial and bodily disfigurements practised, apparently, in the pursuit of some horribly misguided conception of aesthetics.

In me this urgency is becoming conscious and reasoned. I refrain from the peculiar asceticisms of the savage and from those later developments of them that set Simon Stylites on his column and influences the practice of some forms of yoga at the present day. But I recognise it as springing from the same source, essentially one in its purpose, although it finds another expression through another instrument. I might, indeed, find a figure in music, and liken this urgency to the desire for harmony and rhythm which once weakly formulated on the tom-tom or the single notes of a pipe, can now be elaborated by a full orchestra.

In effect the single purpose of this inner urgency appears as an effort to attain control of what we recognise as the physical body. In the very beginning this gospel exhibits its tendency to self-denial or self-torture. It is at this stage a wordless gospel; it appears to have little relation to ethics; but it struggles continually against the natural desire for the satisfaction with the least possible effort of the bodily appetites. Simple man prefers ease, the fulfilment of his natural proclivities, the comfort of rest and repletion, but "the holy yeast works in his timid flesh," compels him from his sloth and his lusts, and prompts him to the making of ordinances that run directly

athwart his animal instincts.

The second broad stage of this urgency to self-denial can be studied in the history of the various religions that developed from these beginnings. All these religions have one feature in common, the need for denying the flesh. For the mass they imposed laws of restraint that now began to display a recognisable ethic. An object had been formulated, the attainment of a heaven as a reward for virtue, and although the laws imposed did little or nothing to fit the conforming congregation for the postulated bliss hereafter, they were, at least, of some service in the growing complexities of civilisation. The totem had grown into an all-seeing God, the rules of exogamy into the command for sexual chastity, and one new ordinance had taken a specific form in the duty of man towards his neighbour. It is the ordinance of all others which is least honoured in spirit, but the letter has been accepted in the West as embodying a religious duty for more than two thousand years.

But if this brief indication of the birth and development of a religious sense in humanity does indeed correspond to some reality, if it is in some sort an approximation to the living truth of man's origin and holds the key to his destiny, what, it may well be asked, is the probable line of its further unfolding in the future? To that, again, I can give only a reply that indicates a personal predilection. Nevertheless, to me it seems inevitable that what has been called "religion" will in time be superseded. The feeble instruments by which man has sought to govern his body, the dogma and ritual of the churches, the idolatry of priesthood as the inspired guide, the exercise of purposeless self-denial, are but increasingly self-conscious elaborations of the primitive Taboo. If, as I personally have no doubt, humanity is to progress to a fuller consciousness, it will be by the way of the inner desire and not by the exercise of those inhibitions which the word "religion" properly implies. We are passing from the stage in which the spirit of man must fight, too often a losing battle, against the animal desires of his body, to that stage in which he shall be strong enough to lead them. And just as the great Teachers and Adepts of the past conformed to no existing religion, so as man grows in the realisation of himself not in relation to the physical world but to universal consciousness, religion as we now recognise it will cease to have any meaning.

J. D. BERESFORD

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

"THE PERMANENT THING THAT IS INDIA"*

[**H. N. Brailsford M. A.**, is better known as a journalist and a socialist than as the author of *Adventures in Prose*, *Shelley, Godwin and Their Circle* and *Olives of Endless Age*. He has been a leaderwriter to many papers, including *The Manchester Guardian* and was Editor of *The New Leader* from 1922-26. —EDS.]

A generation ago our conception of the origin of Greek civilisation and its place in history was revolutionised by Sir Arthur Evans' discoveries in Crete. It had been supposed that this Aryan race, descending in a state of barbarism on a beautiful land with a genial climate, evolved in a few centuries this ripe and gracious culture by the light of their own unaided genius. We know to-day that this civilisation of theirs had a long pedigree. These simple Aryans, blonde warriors who lived only for battle and the chase, broke into the mature and ancient culture of the Mediterranean, destroyed the fine flower of it in the Minoan Kingdoms of Crete, but none the less absorbed it, learned its lessons, and carried it in the end to a higher development than its first authors ever attained.

We are now passing through the same experience in our notions of Indian civilisation and its origins. Again it is the spade of the archæologists that brings its dramatic revelation, for Sir John Marshall's discoveries† at Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa are destined to upset traditional beliefs exactly as did those of Sir Arthur Evans at Knossus. The parallel is singularly close. In India as in Greece we now realise that the Aryan invaders, gallant but unlettered warderers who knew nothing of city life, must have found, in the rich lands which lured them southwards, an urban civilisation already ancient and intellectually mature. After a period of turmoil and conquest, the older civilisation took its captors captive, and gradually imposed upon them its own thinking, its arts, its letters, much of its religion and perhaps its social structure as well. Again, however, in India as in Greece, the Aryans retained what was perhaps their noblest possession, their subtle and musical language, and imposed it (in the North at least) on the mixed population which accepted their sway. There is this difference, however, bet-

* *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization*. Being an official account of Archæological Excavations at Mohenjo-Daro carried out by the Government of India between 1922 and 1927. Edited by Sir JOHN MARSHALL. In 3 Volumes. £ 10. 10*s*.

† The real discoverer was Mr. Rakhal Das Banerji; see *The Modern Review* of April 1932 (p. 367) and June (p. 703).—EDS.

ween the two cases. The ancient world which is emerging from the sands of Sind is still alive. The yogi of to-day and the votary of Siva retain a faith which had its origins five thousand years ago on the banks of the Indus. There were, indeed, scholars notably Oppert and Pargiter, who had reached these same conclusions by a brilliant and daring process of inferences. These cities that have risen from the desert confirm their reasoning by a direct appeal to our eyes.

The results of the work of Sir John Marshall and his colleagues are now available to the student in three superbly printed and beautifully illustrated volumes, issued at the formidable price of ten guineas. They deal only incidentally with the other equally important site, Harappa, nor do they include a record of the latest seasons of digging. There is much still to be recovered and revealed none the less, there is ample material here for study and speculation, and this book will rank with the work of Evans and Woolley among the formative influences of our time. It is so admirably arranged and so lavishly illustrated that the untravelled reader can hardly fail to get from it something of the thrill of wonder and awe that comes to the visitor who has the good fortune, as I had recently, to see these astonishing ruins. Sir John Marshall is on the whole cautious and reserved in the general chapters which discuss the Indus civilisation and its authors. He risks no guess as to whence they came or the nature of their relations with the contemporary peoples who developed kindred but distinct civilisations in Persia and Mesopotamia. About two things only is he sure. He is convinced that these cities throve round about the central date 3,000 B. C. for a period of 500 years. He is certain that this civilisation was sharply, even violently distinct from that of the Aryans, which it preceded by a clear millennium or more.

The impression that one derives from these ruins is of a civilisation opulent and orderly beyond anything that its contemporaries had attained. Sumeria had temples of unsurpassed splendour: Egypt squandered a kingdom's wealth on her pyramids. Here *in Mohenjo-Daro the object was rather to make life agreeable for the mass of the citizens.* Nowhere in the ancient world was domestic architecture so advanced before the days of imperial Rome. So much has been written about the great public bath (which probably had a religious use), the solid houses of burned brick, the elaborate system of public drainage, the townplanning evidenced in the lay-out of streets and lanes that intersect at right angles, that I need not repeat the details. One is curious about the nature of the municipal government, and the economic activities that supported so much wealth. As to that one can only guess. *Nothing suggests an over-shadowing despotism of the usual ancient type.* It is possible that these cities owed

their wealth to manufacture for export. They shared with their contemporaries all the industrial arts of the Chalcolithic Age. They grew wheat and barley, had domesticated cattle, sheep, pigs, dogs and the elephant, were familiar with wheeled carts, made pottery on the wheel, wove cloth, worked in gold, silver, copper and bronze, and used a pictographic script. How much of all this they invented or improved we do not know, but one discovery certainly stands to their credit. They first grew the true cotton, which even the Greeks knew as sindon. One precious rag of it has survived. My guess based on the many dyers' vats that have been found, is that already round about 3,000 B.C. India exported this cloth. There is proof of trade with Southern India and Mesopotamia. It is not probable that these proto-Indians were themselves a sea-faring people, but there is evidence (subsequent to the finds recovered in this book) that they knew sea-going ships.

The climate of Sind was certainly less arid than it is to-day, but the Indus, indispensable as a great river was to every early civilisation, was then as now a turbulent stream. The city was often flooded and as often rebuilt, until at length the inhabitants seem to have lost heart and migrated elsewhere, taking with them all the possessions that they valued. The result is unfortunate for us. The finds are much less numerous than one would expect from the extent and the good preservation of the ruins, and consist largely in such things as toys of pottery that were not worth removing. The dead were usually cremated (though fractional burials occur) so that we miss the pompous monuments that reveal the life of ancient Egypt and Ur. Whither the inhabitants went we do not know. This civilisation extended from Simla to Karachi, and in a simpler provincial form far into Baluchistan. Whether, as is probable, it had spread much further East remains for future diggers to discover. War was not an important part of the life of these cities. Their offensive arms were inferior to their industrial tools and they had no defensive armour—a fact which doubtless told to the advantage of the Aryan invaders.

Enough has been rescued from these ruins to prove that these people had a notable, even a great art. Their architecture indeed is rather solid than beautiful, though they may have carved wood. The few statues are all broken and some of them are poor, conventional work. But there is a little nude dancing girl in bronze, a typical aboriginal, who moves me by her vivacity and grace beyond any human figure that has survived from the ancient world. Sir John Marshall writes much too coldly about her, but he does full justice to the torso of a dancer in black stone, from Harappa, so astonishing in skill of its rendering of a difficult pose, that some have argued that it must date from the period of

Greek influence. But it is on the numerous seals that the reputation of these earliest Indian artists mainly rests. The best of them are masterpieces of the engraver's art, as vivid in their drawing as they are skilful in execution. To them, indeed, we owe most of our knowledge of this civilisation. No progress, unhappily, has been made towards deciphering the pictographic script which accompanies the designs. It seems to read from right to left and the three or four hundred signs probably had a syllabic value. Professor Langdon reports in a hasty note that they closely resemble the proto-Sumerian script, and argues (though his demonstration does not seem convincing) that they were the parents of the Brahmi alphabet.

The seals supply, first of all, the only sure evidence for dating this civilisation. Five Indian seals have been found in the cities of Sumeria and Elam, two of them in strata which certainly belong of the time before King Sargon. Perhaps Sir John Marshall uses this fact rather modestly to date these cities. These seals certainly belong to this culture, but did not necessarily come either from Mohenjo-Daro or Harappa. They may have come, for example, from the hypothetical site to which the people of the former city removed. The style did not change as time went on. It is therefore conceivable that Mohenjo-Daro* flourished some centuries before the dates (3250-2750 B. C.) which he assigns to it. What is certain is that it cannot be dated later.

Most of the seals show animals presumably sacred to the gods of the city. The creature most often depicted is a unicorn, which may have had the place in early Indian symbolism that it afterwards held in Persian mythology. Next in honour comes the humped bull, not the sacred Aryan cow, but Siva's symbol. These artists had the same habit as the Sumerians of inventing fantastic composite animals. In both lands deities wore horns. We see on one seal a figure half-human half-animal at grips with a tiger, who comes (it has been argued) straight out of the Gilgamesh epic: he is said to be that hero's companion Eabani, who on Sumerian seals destroys a lion.† Some elements then of a common mythology both peoples had. One notes that both wore the same peculiar kilt: both wore their hair in a bun. To my mind such facts (and there are many more) suggest a racial and not merely a trading connection. *The tradition of the Sumerian city of Eridu‡ was that civilisation came to it from the sea. Much points to the possibility that the Indus civilisation was the earlier of these two, and may have been one of the several influences that started Mesopotamia on its great career.*

Another group of seals shows a procession in which an image of the unicorn was carried on a standard. Behind it is carried the curious cult object, perhaps a censer, which is always shown with it. Before it is another object which exactly resembles the standard with a long streamer peculiar to pre-dynastic Egypt. These three seals are companions to the picture of a procession carrying sacred beasts shown on a slate palette of Narmer, one of the earliest Egyptian kings. Similar standards are in use today, as Professor Elliott Smith has shown, in Indonesia. What conclusion shall we draw? Not necessarily that early Egypt and early India were in direct touch. But certainly we must conclude that a whole complex of ideas and rites connected with kings, standards, sacred and probably totemic animals, was somehow common to Egypt and India. Perhaps as Professor Childe has argued, there was a fourth sea-faring and pioneering civilisation in Arabia, which linked the Nile, the Euphrates and the Indus and helped to diffuse beliefs and rites, crafts and institutions. The reports by recent travellers of buried cities even in the central deserts make this guess more plausible.

A third group of seals has, if possible, an interest even more intimate, for it reveals the origin of some of the oldest and most vital elements of Indian religion. One seal shows a god seated in the contemplative posture of a Buddha on a low throne: two suppliants worship him supported by two nagas. A statue which may represent either a priest or a god is gazing with half-closed eyes on the point of his nose. *One cannot doubt that already at this date Indians practised the discipline of yoga, and held at least the basic beliefs about spirit and matter and the power of self-conquest on which it rests.* A third seal shows us a triune three-faced god, again seated with his limbs exactly in the yogi's posture: the animals that accompany him justify Sir John Marshall's conviction that, by whatever name, this city honoured Siva, the patron and teacher of yogis. His headdress resembles that of the Great Mother—evidently they were a divine pair. We meet still more frequently his *linga* and his bull. The Great Mother shared with him the devotion of the Indus people. The clay statuettes that represent her have been in every house. They are of the same crude archaic type that occurs all over the ancient world: there is in the British Museum a specimen from Cyprus which one can hardly distinguish from these Indian images. Under innumerable names, she, too, lives on, sometimes in terrible, sometimes in beneficent shapes, in every village of the Peninsula.

* *Cf.* "Vedic Chronology": A case for 11,000 B. C. in THE ARYAN PATH for April 1931 and "Antiquities of Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro" in THE ARYAN PATH for January 1930, both by Prof. S. V. Venkateswara.—EDS.

† This is Sir John Marshall's interpretation, but to my eyes the figure is certainly a female, and seems to be connected with the Tree of Life.—H. N. B.

‡ Theosophical students should read what H. P. Blavatsky has to say about this famous city and its commercial and religious relation to India—*The Secret Doctrine*, II. 139, 203, 226, 693.—EDS.

But indeed though they had their original rites and beliefs, this people adhered to the Catholic Church of their age. Like every agricultural folk, they invoked the principle of fertility and vegetation as a tree, spirit or goddess, and she too figures on these seals. On one of them she gives birth to a bough. The *pipal* was her home, and then as now the marriage of trees was celebrated. *Nothing of this ancient world has perished—neither its cottons, nor its gods.* If the contribution of the Aryans recedes, as the result of these discoveries, in our picture of the enduring life of the permanent thing that is India, her isolation is ended in another way. She takes her place with the pioneers who in these breathless centuries of invention created civilisation between the waters of the Indus and the Nile.

H. N. BRAILSFORD

The Six Ways of Knowing—A critical study of the Vedanta Theory of Knowledge. By D. M. DATTA, M. A., Ph. D. (George Allen and Unwin, London. 15*s.*)

Putting together the subject-matter of his investigation of a distinctive problem of Indian Philosophy, conducted when he had the privilege of occupying the Prabodha Chandra Basu Mallik Chair of Indian Philosophy in the period 1925–28, Dr. Datta has discussed the status and significance of the *Six* Pramanas, means, sources and guarantors of valid knowledge advocated by the Advaitic system of thought, subjecting them to critical analysis and evaluation in the light of the epistemological technique current in contemporary speculation in the West. Believing that in "an age of international understanding," interpretation of the problems of Indian Philosophy to the West is essential, and feeling that notwithstanding the work of some Indian and European thinkers in this sphere there is yet enough scope for others, the author has endeavoured to "present, after critical analysis and evaluation the contribution of *some* Indian thinkers in a special branch of philosophy". (Preface.)

Having localised and marked off the boundaries of "Prama" (valid knowledge) and "Pramana" (source, means and guarantor of valid knowledge) in the "Introduction," Dr. Datta devotes the First Book extending over five chapters to the epistemology of "Pratyaksha" (Perception). In the first chapter, the inevitability of a reaction between epistemology and metaphysics is emphasised. The second discusses the definition of "Pratyaksha," and the third the "psychology of perception". It is obvious that perception or any other process is psycho-physical or psycho-somatic and points to a subject-object relation. The fourth chapter deals with the subject or the self in perception. The objects of perception are dealt with in the fifth. "Upamana" (comparison) "Anupalabdhi" (non-cognition) and "Anumana" (Inference) form the subject-matter of second, third, and the fourth books respectively. The fifth Book examines "Arthapatti" (postulation). The sixth, and concluding book running over six chapters undertakes a pretty elaborate survey of the "Sabda-Pramana" (Testimony).

From this summary, it is clear that Dr. Datta has concentrated his expository and critical attention on the *six* pramanas admitted and advocated by the Advaita Vedanta, and as embodied in shorter manuals and primers like the "Vedanta Paribhasha". In all the relevant contexts he has successfully correlated the Vedantic doctrines with those prevalent in the West. While the

general exposition, method of treatment, control over texts are all commendable, certain statements made by Dr. Datta in the course of the volume call for critical comments.

(1) In the first place, Dr. Datta's treatment of the doctrine of "Adhyasa" in relation to the "Pramanas" is unfortunately very scrappy, and the scrappiness has pushed into the background a problem of paramount importance in the Advaitic theory of knowledge. The contrast between "objects as they are" and "objects as they appear to be" is as old as Parmenides, and Sankara has maintained that all the affairs and transactions of life, secular and spiritual, owe their origin to a Fontal or Foundational Folly—Adhyasa—erroneous or error-ridden ascription of the qualities of "Atma" to the "Anatma" and those of the latter to the former. In his Bhashya on the Vedanta Sutras, the Acharya makes his position clear with remarkable brilliance. "Tametamavidyakhyamaatmanatmanoritaretaradhyasam-puraskritya–sarve–pramanaprameya–vyavaharah–laukika–vaidikascha–pravrittah". (Page 20, Bombay Edition—with Bhamati, Ratnaprabha, and Anandagiriya.) Dr. Datta has examined the six Pramanas, but, their operations, jurisdiction, the results they lead to are all enveloped in a colossal cosmic error, or Fontal, Foundational Folly. Here, if anywhere, there is a real and genuinely felt philosophical need for a thorough critical investigation. In the history of Indian philosophy, the existence of the Fontal, Foundational Folly has been controversially repudiated by the followers of Ramanuja and Madhva, and in the onward march of European and American system-building as well the Kantian contrast between "things as they are" and "things as they appear" has been shown its proper place by Realists, and I regret to have to observe that Dr. Datta in a volume exclusively devoted to a discussion of the problem of the Pramanas admitted and advocated by the Advaitins, has not investigated if any rational or reason-sanctioned authority can be cited in support of the existence of the said Fontal Folly. A perception like S is P is invested by the Advaitins with an air of monistic mysticism, and the "Advaita Siddhi" explains how the "Antah-karana" takes on the form of objects perceived, and how at the moment of perception an electric-flash like identity is established among three self-units or spiritual units. (Pramatrichaitanya-vishayaprakasaka-chaitanya—and adhishthana-chaitanya.)

A doctrine like this deserves to be brought before the bar of reason, but, Dr. Datta has merely glossed over the entire question. While on page 50, "Adhyasa" is done into "confused mutual identification," on page, 52, it is translated into "mutual association". The Vedantic "Antahkarana" may or may not stand comparison with the "*Physiological Gestalt*," (p. 68) but the relevant question is—is the knowledge in the engendering of which "Antahkarana" plays such a prominent part confined merely to the realm of appearances?

(2) Secondly, Dr. Datta uses in one and the same paragraph, three terms "sources," "ways" and "methods" in translating the term "Pramana". (p. 19.) This state of affairs is surely unfortunate. A Pramana is not merely the source or means of valid knowledge, but also a guarantor of the validity of knowledge. When the sense-object rapprochement is normal or normally established, knowledge is valid and the validity is guaranteed by the rapprochement itself.

(3) Dr. Datta's attempt at showing that "Arthapatti" is "postulation" has landed him in a strange predicament. Assumptions and postulates, methodological and otherwise, are admitted as foundations for the erecting of the superstructure of a given science. Indian Psychological investigation postulates the reality of "souls". The familiar illustration is this. An individual Dick or Devadatta who fastidiously fasts during the day time is hale, hearty, and healthy. How are the observed health and happiness of the individual to be

reconciled with his daily fasting programme? Surely, fasting and perfect health are incompatible with one another. To bring about as it were a factual as well as a speculative reconciliation between day-time fasting and the observed unimpaired health of the individual, it has to be admitted that the said individual should have enjoyed a delicious diet during nights!! In the absence of this admission, an observed and noted fact, namely, the health of the individual becomes inexplicable. The admission is necessitated by the Laws of Thought and corresponds to indirect proof of demonstration with which one is familiar in works on Western Logic. It involves a passage or transition from the known to the unknown. From this interpretation of "Arthapatti" to Dr. Datta's term "postulation" actually used, it is indeed a far cry. If the terminology of Western Inductive Logic is to be employed, "Arthapatti" indicates passage procedure from an observed effect or phenomenon to its hidden cause. From the very nature of the case and the circumstances attending on it, the hidden cause may not be dragged from its logical Purdah as it were and exhibited to the unholy gaze of the public.

(4) I find that the Vedantic dictum "S a r v a m-jnyatataya-ajnyatatayachasakshi bhasyam" is cited twice first on page 77, and secondly on page 78. One of the citations appears to me to be redundant.

(5) The last quarter of the stanza quoted in the third footnote found on page 130, should read "Abhedo-nilataddhiyoh" and not as wrongly printed.

(6) Dr. Datta has absolutely no justification whatever when he makes reference to "Gauda-brahmanandi" on page 72. Brahamananda Sarasvati has written a commentary on "Advaita Siddhi" of Madhusudana Saraswati, entitled "Guruchandrika," and this latter work is also known after its author "Brahmanandiyam". In these days when non-violence is claiming and gaining recognition as a universal method of dealing with one's fellowmen, Dr. Datta does great violence to the Vedantic or Sanskrit Philosophical Muse when he describes the work of Brahmananda as "Brahmanandi".

(7) A comic element which would lift dry-as-dust metaphysics into the regions of romance lurks in the description of the scope of Dr. Datta's work printed on the outer-most green cover. While the publishers' announcement heralding the volume claims that "this volume gives a comprehensive and clear survey of the principles of *Indian Logic* (italics mine) with due references to corresponding features of Occidental Logic," according to the author, what is attempted is a "Critical study of the Vedanta Theory of Knowledge".

(8) Why does Dr. Datta render "Sabda" into "Testimony"? It is perfectly legitimate to speak of the testimony of perception and of inference, and the correct rendering is obviously "valid verbal testimony".

(9) Finally, Dr. Datta sums up "that the Advaita view that the conditions of knowledge itself are the grounds both of its validity and the knowledge of its validity is reasonable". (pp. 338-339.) Surely, it is reasonable, but, I hope that Dr. Datta cannot have forgotten the fact that the "conditions" themselves are error-ridden in virtue of "Adhyasa".

None of these comments would affect the general excellence of the systematic treatment of the Advaita Theory of Knowledge attempted by Dr. Datta and I congratulate him in conclusion on his fine volume on "The Six Ways of Knowledge" which constitutes a splendid and brilliant addition to the stock of existing literature on Indian Philosophy.

R. NAGA RAJA SARMA

Those Superstitions. By Sir CHARLES IGGLESDEN (Jarrolds, London. 6*s.*)

Sir Charles Igglesden has for many years made a hobby of collecting old beliefs which are now gathered in this book. It is a popular collection, of the kind that prompts the reader to add a few from his own experience. Those who take more than a casual interest in the subject may well complain that the author has jumbled superstitions from all kinds of places, sources, and times without any indication of their origin; and some of the explanations are startling. It may, perhaps, be fact that "those men who took an active part in the exploration of Tutankhamen's tomb perished one by one" though the chief explorer seems to have survived; but it is harder to believe the statement that "there is no doubt that the ancient Egyptians, as in most things, knew as much about poisonous gas as we know to-day, and when they reverently sealed up the tombs of their dead permeated the atmosphere with fumes of gas which should poison anyone who broke into the sanctuary". This is sheer nonsense; all the rest of the royal tombs were robbed within a few generations of their first sealing.

The author has gathered his collection into kinds "The Flower," "Courtship," "Tragedy" and so forth. It is interesting to re-group them, when many will fall into one of three categories: protective—to ward off evil; magical—to bring about some end which cannot be achieved by normal means; and crude science. It is not utterly unreasonable for shepherds to destroy twin black lambs at birth lest they bring disaster, for abnormalities betoken a disturbance in the course of nature and the intrusion of some unknown factor; eugenists, if they could, would do the same with human black sheep. The midwife who slipped a boy's shirt on a baby girl so that she should grow up attractive to men was in an indirect way using magic to provide future employment. Whilst the gardener who proclaimed that it was useless to grow shallots unless planted on the shortest day and collected on the longest was merely expressing in forcible terms the cultural note that shallots planted in December are ready to ripen off in June; by a curious coincidence on the day after I read this book my gardener made the same observation with an apologetic "they say".

G. B. HARRISON

Medieval India. By A. YUSUF ALI. (Humphrey Milford, London. 5*s.*)

The history of Medieval India, like the history of the Middle Ages of Europe, is just beginning to receive the serious attention of scholars. The long neglect of this period was most undeserved because the so-called modern history of India cannot be understood without constant reference to our medieval history. But with a pathetic historical bigotry the previous generation of writers continued to treat Indian history into water-tight compartments like Hindu, Mahammadan and British periods which are as *communal* as they are wrong from the point of view of organic evolution of Indian history. It was high time that the overlapping and interpenetration of the Hindu, the Mahammadan and the Christian elements should be brought out forcibly to counteract the unhistorical bias of the previous generation. The Hindu historians should pay more and more intensive and sympathetic attention to the study of Islamic history and institutions and the Mahammadan historians should show larger tolerance for and deeper interest in the life of their Hindu neighbours who after all are co-partners in the colossal undertaking of building a New India. It is a very hopeful sign that Hindu historians like Prof. Jadunath Sarkar, Prof. Beni Prasad, Prof. Iswari Prasad and others have come forward as real pioneers in this line of historical research and we welcome Mr. Yusuf Ali, the author of this important little volume, as our first Moslem *confrère* in this great task of historical *rapprochement* between Hindu and Islamic India. Like a true

historian that he is, Mr. Yusuf Ali emphasises the fundamental importance of the sense of continuity: "The breaking up of our history into water-tight compartments works almost as much mischief as false history. If Muslims and Hindus fought with each other in the past, there is no reason why the feuds should be continued in changed circumstances in the present and in the future."

It is highly inspiring and refreshing to find a Muslim author making a thoroughly objective and at the same time deeply sympathetic study of Hindu social and economic life from the 7th to the 14th century (A. D.) King Harsha (647 A. D.), that incarnation of religious tolerance; the Poet Rajasekhara (900 A. D.)—a Brahmin marrying a Rajput princess; Alauddin Khalji, (1316 A. D.) a pioneer of socialism and total prohibition; and Firoz Taghlauk of great public works (1388 A. D.), each in his turn comes to contribute their quota to the general progress of India. So on the plane of Spiritual synthesis "Kabir and Guru Nanak may be cited as examples in a large galaxy of religious and social reformers who prepared the way for modern India". This vast historical canvas is worthy of an epic brush of a Michelangelo bringing out the vigorous modelling as well as the dramatic conflict of light and shade in the representation of this Indian fresco of "War and Peace". But even miniature studies on this subject, as done by Mr. Yusuf Ali with the eye of a painter, are welcome. The get-up of the book is worthy of the Oxford University Press.

KALIDAS NAG

Prometheus Bound. By AESCHYLUS. Translated into English Rhyming Verse with Introduction and Notes by GILBERT MURRAY. (Allen & Unwin, London. 2*s.*)

Although it is usually recognised that the legend of Prometheus embodies a profound philosophical idea, there has never been any agreement as to its proper significance. Many writers have maintained that it represents a mythological account of the discovery of fire by primitive man. Professor Gilbert Murray rightly ignores this superficial view. He suggests, rather, that the legend should be taken to describe the endless struggle of man, conscious within himself of moral values, to impose them upon a world which appears to be totally indifferent to them.

There is, indeed, a hint of the truth in this hypothesis, but, stated in such general terms, it strikes one as being devoid of precise connotation. For an exact, penetrating, and thorough discussion of the subject we must still go to *The Secret Doctrine* where Madame Blavatsky explains this. At least three distinct meanings may be discerned in her interpretation; distinct but not unrelated; distinct, but uniting to form a single great cosmological conception.

In the first place, the conflict which is of the essence of the legend is the conflict within human nature between its higher and lower elements. Prometheus here stands for the intellectual and spiritual aspects of man, while Zeus is the symbol of the physical, animal, sensual aspects. Or, to take man in the ideal sense, humanity itself is Prometheus tormented by the eternal vulture of unsatisfied desire and bound by the chains of its bestial instincts. (*S. D.* II, 412-414) This perpetual and undeniable conflict is attributed by Madame Blavatsky to the circumstances of man's origin according to the esoteric doctrine, which teaches that man is the joint creation of two different orders of cosmic entities. Zeus is the symbol of the primeval progenitors, the *Pitar*, who created the earliest races of man on a level with the members of the animal kingdom, "senseless and without mind". The fire brought down from "heaven" as a gift to mankind is the sacred spark of reason and spiritual consciousness infused into the animal man by a class of "devas" not indigenous to the earth and symbolised by Prometheus. The complete man of our race has been fashioned by this combination of spiritual and material forces. (*ibid.* 94-95)

Finally, the Promethean gift becomes a "curse" because it is blended with the refractory material of the lower nature. Spiritual development on the one hand, and mental and physical on the other, being incapable of proceeding at an equal pace, engender disharmony and give rise to Evil. Mankind is saved from mental darkness but at the cost of its former tranquillity. "The sin and redemption of Prometheus consists in preferring intellectual, self-conscious pain to instinctive beatitude." In thus raising man to a way of life that involves suffering, and thereby himself merging with man, Prometheus sacrifices his heavenly existence to share in the pains and tribulations of humanity. (*ibid.* 410-415)

Such is the explanation, supported by a wealth of philological and anthropological data, which the student will find in *The Secret Doctrine.*

K. S. SHELVANKAR

Our Compelling Gods and Life's Evolutionary Cycle. By H. F. HAWES. (Headley Brothers, London.)

Mr. Hawes builds his book upon the theory of the "group-spirit," a term used by Professor McDougall for the collective consciousness of any association of men or animals. He starts with the assumption that evolution is cyclical, with an outward movement from the one to the many, and a return movement back to unity; and endeavours to prove that this return swings, in which humanity is now moving, operates by the formation of ever larger and larger groups. Each one of these has its own "spirit," which is, in the author's words:

> more or less of a divinity to the units which form its group, and religion with all that the word implies is man's reaction to the influence of the spirit of the largest group he is at any stage conscious of belonging to . . . . we can in imagination go beyond the human race and postulate a group-spirit which has for its kingdom all creation . . . . . Such a spirit . . . . .would possess all the qualities characterising the Christian's idea of God.

Mr. Hawes endeavours to prove the existence of this "Universal Group-Spirit," or God, by a process of analogy from the lesser "group-spirits," whose existence he assumes. But there is no real analogy at all in the matter. The collective consciousness of a human group is the creation of the thought of its units, and is charged with their emotion as a Leyden jar is charged with electricity. It is a secondary, derived, phenomenon, which arises and passes away in time; whereas the reality underlying all phenomena—variously called the Absolute, the Self, the One Life, Parabrahm—is timeless, eternal, immutable.

Nevertheless, despite this fallacy in his main argument, Mr. Hawes's book, which is fundamentally an attempt to restate Christianity in terms of human experience, will be of interest, not only to his fellow Christians of the broader type, but to thinkers of all religions.

Mr. Hawes posits conscious membership of the universal group as the goal of human evolution. He recognises the brotherhood of all men and the essential oneness of the high religions. To Buddhism in particular he makes several sympathetic references, though there is no sign that he has made any close study of its literature. Some of its teachings, however, he seems to have worked out for himself.

On the subject of re-incarnation Mr. Hawes has come to no certain conclusion, although he recites some very cogent reasons in its favour.

> "If we do not (reincarnate)" he says, "the lesson, in so far as we do learn it, would seem to be invalid for any other life but this earthly one . . ."

The ordinary Western tenet of the immortality of the personal self does not appeal to Mr. Hawes; and no wonder! Only when distinction is made between the personality, which dies, and the individuality, which persists to pursue the path to perfection through a series of rebirths, does the doctrine of survival become satisfying at once to our reason, our sense of justice, and our highest aspirations.

R. A. V. M.

In the Footsteps of the Buddha. By RENE GROUSSET. (Routledge, London.)

Those who are familiar with *The Life of Hiuen-Tsiang* and *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, translated by the Rev. Samuel Beal, will welcome M. Réné Grousset's scholarly contribution to our knowledge of this great Chinese pilgrim who served Buddha with unfailing devotion and with a courage beyond praise. M. Grousset has added much new material based upon the discoveries of Sir Aurel Stein, Herr Von Le Coq and other writers who have within recent years found so much of vital interest in Central Asia. His commentary is never obtrusive and his learned disquisitions never cloud the radiance of Hsüan-tsang and his noble quest. In M. Grousset's Foreword he refers to "this immense effort towards goodness and beauty," and in the pages that follow he never forgets that he is dealing with a spiritual adventure, with a learned saint whose wisdom was no less than his courage in time of danger.

At the commencement of the T'ang dynasty Hsüan-tsang, when about twenty-six years old, set forth on his long journey to India. He endured hunger, thirst, was set upon by bandits and wild animals, experienced bitter cold and scorching heat, was constantly abused by those he encountered. He endured all things with a fortitude that never failed. He was determined to see some of the sacred places associated with Buddha, resolved to bring back from India, his Holy Land, various Buddhist texts, written in Sanskrit, in order to amplify the Buddhist literature in China which was in many ways defective. He was absent sixteen years, but during that period he had fulfilled his mission. He brought back to China six hundred sacred books and many Buddhist relics and statues. In the seclusion of the Convent of the Great Beneficence, with a carefully chosen staff to help him, he set to work on translation and commentary. "Each morning," we read, "he set himself a fresh task, and if during the day some business had prevented him from completing it, he never failed to go on with it at night. If he met with some difficulty, he would put the book down, and then, after worshipping Buddha and fulfilling his religious duties until the third watch, he would rise and read aloud the Indian text and mark in red ink, one after another, the passages he was to read at sunrise."

Hsüan-tsang was an uncompromising Mahāyānist. He would frequently engage in learned discourse concerning the Greater Vehicle, and was, perhaps, an almost fanatical adherent of this particular form of Buddhism. This splitting of metaphysical hairs, the meaning of "absolute nature," "non-duality" and so on will seem to some of us far removed from the simpler and more direct teaching of the Buddha. If we question the wisdom of setting great store by such Buddhist metaphysicians as Asaṅga, we are in no doubt as to Hsüan-tsang's attitude toward the Master he served so well. The long self-sacrificing journey is convincing proof of the spiritual power within this Chinese Master of the Law.

In 664, when finishing his translation of the *Prajñā Pāramitā* ("The Perfection of Sapience"), he was rapidly approaching the end of his earthly existence. A few hours before his death he saw "an immense lotus flower of charming freshness and purity". He said to his disciples: "I desire to see the merit I have acquired by my good deeds poured out on other men; to be born with them in the Heaven of the Blessed Gods (Tushita), to be admitted into the household of Maitreya and there to serve that Buddha who is so full of tenderness and love. When I return to earth to live out other existences, I desire, at each new birth, to fulfil with unbounded zeal my duties towards Buddha and to attain to transcendent understanding". In that lovely confession of faith, that crystal-clear adoration of the Buddha there was no talk of the Greater and Lesser Vehicle. His last words were: "I desire, in common with all men, to see thy loving countenance."

HADLAND DAVIS

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"————*ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."

HUDIBRAS.

In the *New English Weekly* of 14th July an article "On Being Modern" contains a few suggestive thoughts. All who aim at making the world and themselves better will find these worth a reflection. The writer points out that "it is far easier to be 'fashionable' than to be truly modern—a thing which requires something more than being just up-to-date . . . . What matters is an advanced consciousness which feels the inner pulse of the entire age and is at one with it; at one with all its deepest problems, needs and crises."

The one problem is born of the cardinal defect of our cycle—"the gap between inner and external life". This is the cause of "spiritual restlessness and of estrangement from life".

The crisis is brought about by the pace of external life which "invariably tends to develop at the expense of the inner life". Also the integrity of the human self is doubly attacked; from within by psycho-analysis, which "concentrates upon the inner man—not in order to affirm him, but in order to analyse him away, . . . which eventually makes one forget that such a thing as human individuality exists at all"; secondly, from without, by "the standardising tendency of the capitalist system, as well as its legitimate but rebellious offspring —Russian Bolshevism".

The need of the hour is "a change which would leave the old consciousness behind as one leaves outworn garments". This will come from the inner urge and need for "a *qualitative* change of all values". "Only those who are ripe for such an attitude can afford to be modern without becoming victims of their own modernity".

But how to become ripe? The article does not tell us. Those who are ripe well know what to do, but what about those who aspire to attain ripeness? In these pages, month by month, some of the most advanced thinkers have shown how religious organizations and political parties hinder the individual in his real growth; how modern science must abandon its old methods and seek aid from philosophy and mysticism; how scientific achievements disturb the moral balance of society; how men and women looking for liberty break the bonds of convention only to find themselves fettered by indulgence and licence; how individuals must aim at making themselves, whole. Not afraid of committing the sin of inconsistency this Journal has welcomed different and even conflicting views, and if it has

succeeded in revealing anything it is the prevalence of the confusion of thought among guides, philosophers and friends of our civilization, about its most crucial problem—integration of the human individual and of the human society. These "leaders" are specialists, each of whom has purposely limited his own horizon; and modern knowledge is an incoördinate and even incoherent mass. How can man integrate himself when the thoughts on which he dwells are disintegrating? He who wishes to ripen must enquire after a *synthesis* of religion, philosophy and science.

Theosophy has taught for ages that every human being is surrounded by an aura which emits rays, beneficent and maleficent. The healing hand, the soothing tone, the evil eye, the withering touch are homely expressions which describe processes well known in occult physio-psychology. A German scientist, Dr. Rahn, now professor of Bacteriology at Cornell University (U.S.A.) is reported (*Science News Letter* for 2nd July) to have "aroused great interest among scientists attending the meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the Society of American Bacteriologists in Syracuse by announcing experiments that seem to parallel scientifically in some respects old superstitions that the human body can exert an evil influence on its surroundings". As usual the experimenter and his colleagues have jumped to certain conclusions which are as worthless as explanations of the phenomena as the latter are interesting in themselves. Leaving speculation alone let us record the facts actually observed:

> Yeast, such as is used in making bread, was killed in five minutes merely by the radiation from the finger tips of one person . . . . . The end of the nose and the eye produce the yeast-killing radiation . . . . In the tests of fingers it was found that the right hand was stronger than the left even in the case of the left-handed persons . . . . . The blood and saliva produce the radiation, but with different people the rays emitted vary greatly. Some people have the power of producing effective radiations and others do not, while it varies with the same person under different conditions. It was also demonstrated that the human body as a whole sends out rays . . . . . Professor Rahn explained that another investigator several years ago found that the blood of women at certain periods sent out a radiation that killed or damaged micro-organisms.

Numerous are the customs observed even to-day by the "illiterate heathen" in India which must be called hygienic and sanitary practices in the light of the above scientific statements.

Meanwhile what instruction does Theosophy offer?—A subtle invisible essence or fluid emanates from human and animal bodies and even things. It is a psychic effluvium, partaking of both the mind and the body, as it is the electro-vital, and at the same time an electro-mental aura, called âkâsic or magnetic aura.